



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1995

No. 28

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 13, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOE KNOLLENBERG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] for 5 minutes.

OPPOSE THE LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANT PROPOSAL

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today we will begin debating H.R. 728, the law enforcement block grant proposal.

With violent crime still the No. 1 concern of most Americans, the voters should know why this proposal will do nothing to decrease instances of violent crime. In fact, having been a police officer for 12 years, as a police officer, we get angry when we hear these proposals about new crime bills, angry because crime is an emotional issue.

But unfortunately it is always being used for political purposes.

Crime is not political. Crime is not Democrat nor Republican. It is not independent. It is personal. Crime violates the self-respect of every individual touched by crime, and elected officials who play politics with crime, or try to seize upon the fear of crime for political gain do a disservice to this country, to their constituency, and to the civility of our own country.

For the past 7 years, there had not been a crime bill. In August 1994 we passed a crime bill.

In the past, crime bills were always defeated because this group or that group or a President would veto a crime bill. While they were busy playing politics with crime, crime has tripled. Violent crime has gone up 300 percent. It has tripled in the last 10 years. Yet the number of police officers on the street helping to combat violent crime has only gone up just a mere 10 percent.

So why are we here today on H.R. 728 after 4 months of passing a crime bill? Pure and simple, we are here because of politics. We are here because one group is trying to capitalize and repeal the work we did in 1994 merely for political purposes.

H.R. 728 will repeal the promise, the provisions to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. They want to take that money for 100,000 more police officers on the street and replace it with a massive block grant program that allows money to be spent with no restrictions, a massive block grant program like we did in the late sixties and early seventies called the Law Enforcement Administrative Agency. The LEAA, Mr. Speaker, was a failure and a very costly one for this country.

For instance, the block grants that were granted in 1968 and 1970 went like this. In Louisiana, a sheriff purchased a tank saying it would be necessary for

crowd control. In Indiana, \$84,000 in LEAA funds were block-granted so they could purchase an aircraft that could be used to fly the Governor around the State. Well, in fact, it did come to Washington once to pick up some Moon rocks and went back to Indiana, really a swell crime-fighting program there.

In Alabama, the LEAA funded a police cadet program. Over \$117,000 was put out for costs of this program that went to the payment to the sons, the friends, and relatives of other high State ranking officials. One State used the money to make a manual, and you know what, the manual turned out to be nothing more than a copy of an existing Federal publication. Another city used the LEAA block grant funds to buy a police car, a Chevrolet Impala. It had no police markings, it had no sirens, it had no flashers. It was used as a private vehicle for the mayor. The city of New Orleans spent \$200,000 in block grants to buy land. Other law enforcement officials did LEAA block grant funds for financial investments. In fact, 33 cents on every dollar spent in LEAA funds went for outside consultants, for administrative costs.

So we are here today with H.R. 728 to redo the pork of Christmases past, to bring back these block grants. The Republicans are going to dismantle the police on the street, the cops on the street program, to go back to block grants.

Since the 1994 crime bill was passed on October 1, it became effective, we have placed 17,000, authorized 17,000 new police officers to be placed in our communities to do community policing.

In a letter dated February 6, the President of the Fraternal Order of Police stated, "We strongly support your resolve to fight any repeal of the funding earmarked for the hiring of 100,000 police officers." February 7, a letter

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H1615

from the executive director of the National Association of Police Officers writes, "Representing over 3,500 police unions and associations and 175,000 sworn law enforcement officers, we ask it not be devastated."

Mr. Speaker, as we begin this debate, I ask that Members look seriously upon the fallacies of H.R. 728. Let us not play politics with crime, and let us put forth and keep the 100,000 police on the street program.

REAL REFORM IS SAY "NO" TO PAC'S

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago America listened during the State of the Union Address as President Clinton stated his support for campaign finance reform. He said to Congress that "We have a lot more to do before people really trust the way things work around here. * * * I ask you to just stop taking the lobbyist perks. Just stop." He also added that "we should also curb the role of big money in elections by capping the costs of campaigns and limiting the influence of the PAC's."

The President's speech reminded me of a speech I heard 2 years ago. In his 1993 State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, "I'm asking Congress to enact real campaign finance reform. Let's reduce the power of special interests and increase the participation of the people."

I remember who the first two Republicans were to give him a standing ovation on those remarks, the then-whip, current Speaker, and myself.

Regrettably, the President let America down over the last 2 years. While Americans demanded reform, and while a bipartisan group in Congress worked to enact real reform, the President did nothing. Oh, yes, he said, "Let's cut it for the President, let's cut it for the Senate, but, by the way, leave it alone in the case of the House, \$5,000 in the primary, \$5,000 in the general from PAC's. For a total of \$10,000."

Reformers in the last Congress, from both parties, advocated reform that would limit, and even ban, political action committees. While we worked, the President stood silently on the sidelines and allowed his party's congressional leaders to block the bipartisan campaign finance reform bill. The so-called Synar-Livingston bill would not eliminate PAC's, but it would have reduced the amount they could give from \$5,000 in an election to \$1,000, the same limit as the maximum for an individual contributor.

Some of those congressional leaders are gone now, sent home or relegated to the minority by the voters last November. With this change in Congress, I hope we are also getting a change in the President's views. With the President's support, we can enact legislation

that will carry out his goals, and the goals of many of us in both parties.

Let me repeat his goals: "Reduce the power of special interests and increase the participation of the people."

I ask my fellow Representatives, what better way is there to reduce the power of special interests than to get rid of political action committees, commonly known as PAC's? And what better way is there to increase the participation of the people than to require that a majority of a candidate's money comes from the people who live in the district that the candidate seeks to represent?

Those are the changes that I support. Those are the changes that many in this Chamber support. I hope the President's words will be followed up with action, action that indicates that he supports these goals too.

Campaign finance reform is a serious issue, and a vital one, but recently there has been far too much noise around what I consider a side note. The President attacked Congress for accepting gifts from lobbyists. He focused his criticism on the \$10 lunch, and on the \$50 golf outing. I do not play golf, so I do not know much about that. But I ask my fellow Representatives, what difference does rejecting a \$10 lunch make if you still accept the \$10,000 campaign check from the same special interest? I tell you that \$10 lunches are not the reason special interest groups have so much influence in Washington these days; \$10,000 campaign checks are the reason.

In the days following the President's address, there have been a number of statements from Members of Congress supporting the President's "Just say no to lobbyists" idea. I want to take a moment to look at those claims of support.

By my count, 32 Members have now taken the "say no to lobbyists" pledge. I heartily salute six of them, three Republicans and three Democrats, for truly saying "no." These six reject not only the \$10 lunch and the \$50 golf game. They also reject the most lucrative gift of all: The \$10,000 campaign check. As in my case, they do not accept PAC money. So, to my six friends, I salute you.

But my reason for standing before you today is not only to salute that bipartisan group of six. The American people deserve to know that a Member who pledges to say "no" to lobbyists is truly saying "no." In an effort to let the voters know which members truly say "no," I want to point out one fact: The 26 other Members who claim to say "no" to lobbyists are in fact still saying "yes" to the biggest gift of all. According to the Federal Election Commission's December 22, 1994, report, these 26 Members accepted an average of \$275,000—and a median of \$224,000—from PAC's. How much of a difference does a declined \$10 lunch make, relative to a quarter of a million dollars from special interest PAC's?

Again, I am not up here to make a partisan statement. Of the 26 members that I refer to, 6 are Republicans.

I am up here, Mr. Speaker, to try to shed a little light on the serious issue of reform. Banning \$10 lunches, whatever symbolic value such a change may have, is not reform—it is not reform because the same lobbyist who cannot buy you lunch can still hand you a \$10,000 campaign check. I say we all must truly reject lobbyists' influence by rejecting all PAC money. The influence of PAC's is a national scandal. The elimination of PAC's will be a long overdue reform.

FURTHER OPPOSITION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to join with my colleagues and following the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] in rising in opposition to H.R. 728, the so-called Law Enforcement Block Grants Act.

What H.R. 728 does is reduce our commitment to putting 100,000 new police officers on the streets of this Nation, and it eliminates, yes, it eliminates the emphasis that has proved so important in cities all across this Nation, and that is the emphasis on community oriented policing.

Every national police organization virtually opposes H.R. 728 and the concepts included therein. They know that community policing works. They know that H.R. 728 provides no guarantees that a single penny of these new block grants will actually go to the police forces of our Nation.

I represent a good part of the city of San Diego, the sixth largest city in this Nation, a city that has many urban problems, where crime is considered the No. 1 concern.

We in San Diego have pioneered the concept of community oriented policing over the last decade. I served on the San Diego City Council for 5 years before I came to Congress and have direct experience with the walking teams, the neighborhood concepts that we have instituted.

I represent neighborhoods that have traditionally been hostile to police forces because of certain history and certain behavior and certain attitudes. Yet those same neighborhoods literally gave standing ovations to the cops that now serve their neighborhoods. They know that community policing works, because it allows those police officers to get to know the neighborhoods that they actually patrol and allows the people in those neighborhoods to get to know them.

You will not find the officers on the walking patrols in San Diego sitting behind desks or processing mail. They are out there on the streets, in the schools, in the neighborhoods, in the

parks, knowing those who are residents, knowing the children, knowing the merchants, and actually being effective in the fight against crime.

We have seen partnerships form, as community and police forces work together to fight crime. In San Diego in every major category of crime we have seen a reduction of at least 10 percent in the last year alone.

Community policing works. We should not allow it to go as H.R. 728 provides. Let us make sure that our comprehensive fight that we have mandated in the crime bill last year proceeds. Let us not move backward. Let us oppose the cut to community policing.

Let us defeat H.R. 728.

WELCOME TO PARKER TRAVIS GERRO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last December my sister, the only sister that I have, had a bouncing baby boy born on December 18, 1994. It is her first child and just a delightful young man.

I would like to read into the RECORD an announcement of Parker Travis Gerro's birth. I want to point out to my colleagues that the poet is not myself but my sister.

WELCOME TO PARKER TRAVIS GERRO

On December 18, '94
A precious life began;
A Texas-style Republican,
Was born to Mike and Jan.
The Gerro's are ecstatic;
Uncle Joe Barton, too.
A new Conservative in Arlington
Is a baby dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to have this young man in the world today. We hope his life is happy, healthy, and productive.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, let me join in welcoming a new conservative Republican in Parker. We want to make sure he grows up so he can have the fruits of a great nation.

FOREIGN POLICY ESTABLISHMENT TRYING TO DERAIL NEXT STEP OF CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy establishment has gone into high gear trying to derail the next step of the Republican Contract With America, and that is going to be debated this week.

We say that no U.S. troops will be under foreign military command.

Our bill ends the Clinton policy of sticking American soldiers into every trouble spot around the world, and in 40 years of sticking the American taxpayers with most of the costs of the U.N. operations. Last November the American people said they wanted a change in foreign policy. We in the new

Republican majority are listening to the people, not the liberal foreign policy elite.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

IN SUPPORT OF DR. FOSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to proudly say I support Dr. Foster, and I am anxiously awaiting the first moderate Republican who does not live in Tennessee to join me.

I think what has happened to Dr. Foster is absolutely scandalous. There has been more distortion of the truth and more churning around this than I have seen in a very, very long time.

Let us talk about what is going on today. Today we see Vice President GORE going to Tennessee to visit Dr. Foster's program, the I Have a Future Program. The I Have a Future Program is targeted at teens, at teens who are highly vulnerable, and the fact that they might become pregnant. And guess what, it has had a long, long track record, and it is working and working very well.

It has worked so well that George Bush gave Dr. Foster one of his points of light for this program. Not only that, he was part of Lamar Alexander's advisory team. Now those are both Republicans the last time I looked, and they were both aware of this program and thought it was a great program.

But when you look at America and America's problems, if we have a future, we have to have a national program dealing with teen pregnancy.

□ 1250

We have thrown a lot of words at it. We have done a lot of finger waiving at it, we have done the Federal nanny role. We have done all sorts of things, but we have not had very many programs that work.

I think this administration is to be complimented for finding a gentleman who has bipartisan support, a gentleman who has a program that works and wants to put him in the national level so we can learn from that and tackle it.

If America has a future, babies having babies is not the way to go. That is the way to end up as a Third World, developing nation because many, many of the boxes are already colored in when babies have babies, and so many sad cases.

I think we should salute him.

Let me talk of some of the things that you have heard thrown around that I think are on the verge of being ridiculous. The latest has been that Dr. Foster sterilized some very, very critically mentally retarded patients in the 1970's and wrote about it. Well, first of

all he wrote about it. He is not trying to hide it.

And second, over 60,000 severely mentally ill people were sterilized from the turn of the century into the late 1970's when we found new and better ways to do this.

Why did the medical practice do it? Why did they do it? It sounds so cruel and so awful by 1995 standards. Well, because at that time there was a sanitation reason, that young women who were severely mentally handicapped had no idea how to deal with their monthly period, and it was a terrific sanitation problem. Plus, the chances of their becoming pregnant because they had no idea what this was all about was also a critical problem.

The entire medical community was doing this as a means of handling it. Thank goodness we now have medication; we have much better ways that seem more humane to us.

But, yes, he did it, yes, he admits he did it. The entire medical profession was doing it at that time. And he wrote about it. And I am sure he wished he did not have to do it, and now he has the tools to do it, so no one has to do it.

Now we are going to hang a man on this? For crying out loud, everything in everyone's profession changes from time to time because of advances.

So I think that is the latest one that comes forward that everybody gets very upset about for no reason except they just want to get rid of Dr. Foster.

The other issue we have heard about is, when he was first asked about abortion, he did not give the same number he gave a little later. He said less than a dozen, and it turned out to be 39.

This is a man in his sixties who has been in practice for a very long time. If he was making a living by doing abortions, he would have starved to death by now. No one could accuse him of doing these lightly; 39 is not a large number.

But the other thing, as a woman, that troubles me is no one ever asked what were these cases like? Was the woman's life in danger? Had this been a rape or incest case? Just as no one asked about the cases of the severely mentally retarded, what condition they were in, why the medical profession thought that was the only choice to go forward? No, all we are hearing is that this man cannot go forward, this is terrible the administration has done it again, on and on and on.

I hope that we say a woman does have a right to choose, and that means nothing if the doctor does not have to listen, and that we as Americans are mature enough to get on with their nomination and get on with fighting teen pregnancy.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 728

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] for 3 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in strong opposition to H.R. 728. The reason I am doing this is not just because I have a personal dislike of this bill but because ever since I was elected I have met regularly with the law enforcement community in my district in Oregon, and they are opposed to this bill.

Why are they opposed to this bill? Why am I opposed? Well, it is a strange bill; it promises a lot of things, it delivers absolutely nothing except tremendous hardship for our police communities who are trying to do community policing, trying to do prevention.

H.R. 728 will mean less police on the streets and less money to prevent kids from committing crimes. It will cut a program that works well, the GREAT program. Why is it a good idea to put some money into prevention? Because it is a very, very much cheaper program; you put a few dollars into prevention and you keep a kid from crime. You put that person in jail, and it is going to cost us \$24,000-plus per year.

But you do not need to take my advice on this matter. You really need to take the advice of the law enforcement community. I say to my colleagues, you do not just have to just join me in voting "no"; let us, all of us, join the National Association of Police Organizations, Fraternal Order of Police, the Brotherhood of Police, the major city chiefs, the National Troopers Coalition, the National Sheriffs Association, the Police Foundation, the National Black Police Foundation. And they join with other organizations, like the Child Welfare League of America, the Children's Defense Fund.

I want to say to my colleagues, we are not all experts in every issue, but we can go to the experts. We can ask them what they think about each piece of legislation. I do that. I ask you to join with the law enforcement community of this country and vote "no" on H.R. 728. It will be bad for our communities, it will be bad for our kids, and it will be horrible for our budget.

VOTE "NO" ON H.R. 728

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the effort of my colleagues in discussing H.R. 728, which will be considered by this House of Representatives today and tomorrow.

There are three issues before us: police, prevention, and pork.

On the police side, we passed a crime bill last year. President Clinton made it clear that he wanted to put 100,000 new police on the streets of America to make our neighborhoods and homes safer.

I represent a congressional district in downstate Illinois, small-town America. I can tell you from my town meetings, my contacts with people I represent, that this is exactly what they want to see. They want to make sure

that there is a policeman in a car, patrolling at night, on the weekends, keeping a eye on their homes, watching out for their families, looking for anything that might be suspicious. That is basically what they are looking for.

Last year's crime bill would deliver it. In fact, last week President Clinton announced in my congressional district, one of many, I might add, 54 new police who will be working in those towns, in those villages, in those cities and counties because of the crime bill we passed last year, 54. A downpayment in my district on a national promise to put 100,000 police on the street protecting us.

The second thing that we were committed to in that crime bill is something that every law enforcement official that I have spoken to supports. They have all said, "Congressman, give us more cops. Build more prisons, but don't think that will solve the problem. You can't build prisons big enough or fast enough to stop crime in America. You have got to do something to prevent crime."

That is part of the program that we passed last year in the crime bill.

Some of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle mock these crime prevention programs. They like to tell you stories about waste and how it is not going to work. I wish some of them would sit down and talk to the policemen I have worked with. I wish some of them would join these policemen as they go into the classrooms under their program, a program conceived under President Reagan's administration, to alert our kids to the dangers of narcotics.

Prevention pays off. Kids learn the dangers of narcotics, stay away from them, do the right thing with the right information. Good prevention, the kind of prevention we want to encourage.

So, with the police and with the prevention, why are we returning now to the crime bill, for goodness sake? It has to do with pork, the third P. Because, you see, the Republican approach in H.R. 728 wants to take all the money that will be earmarked for new policemen and hand it over to mayors and local officials and let them in their judgment decide how to spend that money.

You might say what is wrong with that? Surely they will do the right thing? Part of maturity is learning from past mistakes.

In the early 1970's we tried exactly what the Republicans want to try now. We called it the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; high-sounding, money from Washington, down to the local level, saying to local officials, "Go fight crime."

Do you know what happened? Do you know what happened to those Federal dollars when they got down to the local level? One out of every three dollars was spent on consultants—not on cops, on consultants.

The Governor of one State decided he would take his law enforcement money

and buy a jet plane for his State, a jet plane.

Another one bought a tank in a small rural town. They kind of went crazy. They bought equipment they did not need. Instead of putting police on the beat, they ended up a lot of buddies and friends with consulting contracts, and the net result of it, it did not work.

Now the Republicans want to return to those thrilling days of yesteryear, turn the money over to the local officials, and let them have it.

Well, let me tell you something: We need cops, not consultants. A lot of people say, if Congress passed the crime bill, why are we considering a new crime bill just a few months later? The answer, my friends, will not be found with police but with politics.

I think the people in this country are sick and tired of folks who are trying to dance around this law and order and crime issue to get a vote, trying to find a new partisan stand to say, "We are tougher on crime."

The President came up with an idea that was sound, was backed on a bipartisan basis last year in the crime bill: 100,000 cops in America. It is going to pay off in a lot of the small towns that I represent, and I think it will pay off nationwide.

But if it is going to work, we have to stop this Republican effort with H.R. 728.

I am happy to join with my colleague from Michigan, Congressman STUPAK, who, before he came to Congress, was a professional law enforcement officer. He has been out there, wearing the shield, putting his life on the line. His judgment on these issues means a lot more to me than the judgment of political consultants who would have us undo a crime bill which is moving in the right direction, a bill dedicated to more cops and prevention and one that does not leave us wide open for pork.

COMMUNITY POLICING IS SUCCESSFUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the Conyers-Schumer substitute that will be offered later on this afternoon.

I say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that I have voted for many of the pieces of legislation that they have brought forth in this session of Congress because I agreed with them and I felt they were right.

But I urge my friends to reconsider what they propose doing to the cops-on-the-streets program. I have spent 14 years in law enforcement, 7 as a county sheriff. And I believe in my heart that if we are going to win the war against crime, to make a significant contribution to reducing crime, we need more police officers on the street.

A clergyman friend of mine once told me that 85 percent of success in anything is physical presence. All of us know that is true in politics. But if you ask anyone in law enforcement what they think about the physical presence of police officers on the street, they will tell you that it works, it will reduce crime, it will have the neighborhoods be involved with the community, and would have a positive reflection on the crime rate.

I also say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that they should spend time in their districts, where we had police community grants awarded last year. I did that this past weekend. I spent time in the borough of Pottstown, which received Federal funding for two police officers about 10 months ago. They have reduced the crime rate in that borough because they have the physical presence of police officers walking the beat and being involved in the community.

I also was very fortunate to have 24 municipalities in my district last week who were awarded funds to hire one additional police officer. I believe that is going to have a great effect on reducing the crime rate in those municipalities.

I urge my colleagues to please reconsider what they are proposing this afternoon, please reconsider what they will do to the program that will put 100,000 police officers on the street.

We do not need to have examples, as the gentleman from Illinois said, of abuse in the grant program. We need to have the police officers on those streets, fighting crime. I urge my colleagues to support the Conyers-Schumer substitute this afternoon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

(Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.)

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COMBEST] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O gracious God, You have made the rivers and oceans and all the mountains, You brought into being people from every place on this Earth and You have done all things for our use and for our satisfaction. But more than all those gifts, O God, You have breathed into us the very breath of life, You know our names and You know our needs even before we ask. We offer this

prayer in gratefulness of these blessings, for the opportunities before us, and for the comfort of Your eternal presence. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SKAGGS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 178. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to extend the authorization for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 257. An act to amend the charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to make eligible for membership those veterans that have served within the territorial limits of South Korea.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8002 of title 26, United States Code, the Chair announces on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, a substitution in the membership of the Joint Committee on Taxation. Mr. DOLE has resigned from the Joint Committee and will be replaced by Mr. HATCH for the duration of the 104th Congress only. Therefore, the membership of the Joint Committee on Taxation for the 104th Congress is as follows: Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. BAUCUS.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1024 of title 15, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, announces the following majority appointments to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. MACK, chairman; Mr. ROTH, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. GRAMS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I was not present on the floor when the rollcall vote for H.R. 666 was taken, the Alien Deportation Act. Had I been present and on the floor, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "aye."

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will: Force Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the congressional budget—we have done this.

It goes on to state that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we have done this; unfunded mandates legislation—we have done this; line-item veto—we have done this; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we are doing this now; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence; family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children; tax cuts for families to lift Government's burden from middle-income Americans; national security restoration to protect our freedoms; Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty; Government regulatory reform; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits; and congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

SUPPORT THE VOLKMER CRIME BILL

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a comprehensive crime bill that will really do something about crime instead of what the House has been doing the past few days. My bill will really build prisons, my bill will repeal the ban on semiautomatic rifles and shotguns, and my bill will put people behind bars who use guns and not let them back out in a revolving door.

Mr. Speaker, we need massive firepower to stop crime in this country and what I am seeing the House do now is fire BB's. The House tried this piecemeal approach at combating crime last year and look where it got us. My bill will return the right of law-abiding citizens to own the gun of their choice and at the same time build prison cells to make sure that if a criminal does a crime they will do the time.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the present Judiciary Committee will not see fit to move this comprehensive crime bill, but instead will continue down this piecemeal approach that we all know will have the same success in the other body as it did last year. If you really want to support a crime bill that focuses on criminals I ask you to support my bill.

WE MUST REFORM LAST YEAR'S CRIME BILL

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's crime bill of 1994 was either a masterstroke of genius or it was a joke wrapped around a sham surrounded by a barrel of pork. I'm inclined to agree the latter possibility is closer to the truth.

The proponents of last year's crime bill proclaimed from every rooftop that 100,000 police would be put on the streets. What they didn't tell anyone was that local governments had to cough up 25 percent of the cost of fielding these police officers. With most local and State governments cracking under the strain of other Federal mandates, many localities could not afford yet another mandate.

Mr. Speaker, we must reform last year's crime bill and help local governments by giving them block grants instead of punishing them with more mandates.

Local control and local problem solving from those on the front line combating crime, that is the key, not one-size-fits-all from an idiocracy ensconced on the banks of the Potomac.

Mr. Speaker, Americans spoke last November 8. They continue to speak through this Contract With America. We will enact it and we will get tough on crime.

TIME TO SHINE BRIGHT LIGHT ON MEXICAN BAILOUT

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, if NAFTA is such a great deal why are we bailing out Mexico?

We need answers and open debate on this and many other questions concerning the Mexican bailout.

It is just flat out wrong for at least 20 billion taxpayer dollars to be put at risk without congressional debate and action. Our willingness to duck—or even talk about—this tough political issue is an object failure of the Congress to meet its constitutional responsibilities.

Congress—not the President—controls the power of the purse and Congress needs to vigorously protect the taxpayers' money. That's why the Banking Committee should favorably and fully act on the resolution of inquiry so we can get some real answers.

Mr. Speaker, we're in the dark and the American people want answers. It's time for Congress to shine a bright light on the Mexican bailout.

REFORMING OSHA REGULATIONS

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about disincentive. In a typically bizarre manner, OSHA has created a rule that provides a disincentive for employers to look out for the safety of their workers. If an employer voluntarily starts a study to see if their employees are at risk due to exposure to chemicals or hazardous materials, OSHA requires that employer to keep medical records for their employees for the duration of their employment plus 30 years.

Employers are not required to do these self-studies, but if an employer wants to begin a voluntary self-study, OSHA makes the costs so prohibitive that no employer in his or her right mind would every try. What employer wants to keep medical records on employees for over 50 years? Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of an agency with no common sense. This is why we need regulatory reform and a moratorium on new regulations until we can sort all this out. OSHA is one agency that needs to be restructured, reinvented, or just plain removed.

STOP THE GRAVY TRAIN FOR RUSSIA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, you heard about Boris, now get a load of Yuri. That is right, Yuri Luzhkov, mayor of Moscow, next President of Russia. Secret meetings, secret budgets, secret records, secret million dollar deals. This guy Yuri makes Boss Tweed look like mother Teresa, but he is a prototype, Congress, of new Russian politicians. He hires his family so he can save money on the car pool.

Meanwhile, they are laughing all the way to the bank with our \$12 billion. To boot, it is being put in a Russian bank.

I think Boris and now specifically Yuri leave a lot to be denied, and I say Congress should stop this \$12 billion gravy train for Russia and invest it in America. I think these guys are no Thomas Jefferson.

THE FIRST 40 DAYS

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, this is day 41 of the new Congress. And what have we really accomplished? Plenty. We passed the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, unfunded mandates reform and the line-item veto. This week we are working to pass the final piece of the crime package that will insure criminals spend their time behind bars in prison, so law abid-

ing citizens do not spend their time behind bars in their homes.

Many of us ran for this office on the promise to take power from Washington and return it to the people closest to the problem. Our bill to fight violent crime recognizes that local governments know best how to deal with the problem. It gives them the tools, then gets out of their way.

Yesterday, President Clinton's Chief of Staff said Washington politicians should direct crime-fighting dollars. Well, President Clinton may think Washington knows best, I think the American people know best.

With this bill we continue to keep our promises to bring real change to Washington, to keep our contract on track and to fight violent crime with local solutions, not Washington-knows-best conclusions.

NOMINATION OF DR. FOSTER FOR SURGEON GENERAL

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, the radical right opposes Dr. Foster's nomination for one reason, and one reason only: because he performed abortions.

The other objections are just a smokescreen. This is not about Dr. Foster's credibility and it is not about hysterectomies. It is about the right to choose.

The American people will not allow a narrow band of extremist special interest groups to derail Dr. Foster's nomination. The majority of Americans do not want the right to pick our Nation's next Surgeon General.

The new anti-choice majority in Congress wants to use this nomination to take American women backward. They want to completely roll back the right to choose. This is just the opening round in that battle.

Mr. Speaker, we will not back down. We will not tolerate the harassment of doctors, whether it occurs in front of clinics or on Capitol Hill. Dr. Foster is in this fight to the finish and he is going to win.

PASS H.R. 728 NOW

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, crime in America is out of control. By the time I finish speaking, an American citizen will be robbed and two more will be assaulted. Someone will be a victim of rape within the next 4 minutes in this country, and before we move on to the legislative business at least one American will be murdered.

Mr. Speaker, those statistics are scary. They scare the American people and they scare law enforcement officials. The only ones who are not scared are the criminals.

The grants included in the so-called crime bill last year had so many strings that most State and local governments could not or would not accept them.

Mr. Speaker, let us cut the strings, let us give local law enforcement officials the power to fight local crime. Let us pass H.R. 728 now, before one more American becomes just another statistic.

ABORTIONS—SAFE, RARE, AND LEGAL

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, is the issue Henry Foster's nomination to be Surgeon General? No, that is not the real issue. What is really going on? This nomination has become the battle ground over abortion rights.

President Clinton could not have put it better. Abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. Yet the Foster nomination has been seized upon by those who would criminalize choice. They see it as a chance to further their extreme agenda.

Now we learn that last fall the Senate Republican Campaign Committee gave tens of thousands of dollars to the Right to Life Committee. The purpose: to increase the number of votes to criminalize choice.

□ 1415

Let us get it straight—safe, rare, and legal.

MISLEADING INFORMATION FROM THE WHITE HOUSE ON THE CRIME ISSUE

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President never ceases to amaze me. He has this incredible habit of setting up these ridiculous straw men for the express purpose of making him look good when someone knocks them over. He has misled us on the issue of Social Security, and now he is trying to mislead us on crime.

The President says he will veto any bill that goes back on his promise of 100,000 new police officers, but like most Clinton promises, the 100,000 new policemen were a hoax from the start to the finish. As Republicans made clear last year during the debate on the crime bill, the Clinton bill would only result at most in 20,000 new cops.

Today I placed a phone call to one of the mayors in my district, the mayor of Calumet City. Last year his city received a grant, a \$1 million grant to fund 13 new police officers. Now, he says, the realities or the strings of the President's program have set in. His city council has only been able to find funding for its 25-percent share, the match it has to put up, for 6 out of 13

of those officers. The local share totals \$800,000 over 3 years.

Calumet City's problems highlight the problems of the President's program. It is not working. It must be changed.

CONFIRM DR. FOSTER

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that the nomination of Dr. Henry Foster as Surgeon General of the United States is a choice of great vision.

This nomination should not and must not be about how many abortions Dr. Foster has performed. Those who oppose a woman's right to choose must take that fight somewhere else. Every woman in America has the right to choose—that is the law of the land. Dr. Foster has done nothing wrong.

Dr. Foster has done a great deal that is right. He has become a leading authority on reducing infant mortality and preventing teen pregnancy and drug abuse.

This is a man who has spent a lifetime working to improve the lives of others. It is clear to me that Dr. Foster should be confirmed as Surgeon General. There are no more questions that need to be answered. Dr. Foster should be confirmed and he should be confirmed now.

U.S. MILITARY FORCES FACED WITH BUREAUCRATIC U.N. LEADERSHIP

(Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the study of recent military conflicts and peacekeeping missions have led to two conclusions: First, in the case of major conflict, the massive presence of U.S. forces is necessary to defeat the aggressor or to contain the threat; second, our American forces must be given the necessary military means and freedom of action to accomplish these goals. Operation Desert Storm has rightly been held as a prime example of a U.S.-led international military force.

Unfortunately, the hope and the lessons of Desert Storm have been lost as we have squandered them away in Somalia and even more in Bosnia.

Over 40 years NATO has successfully preserved the peace and freedom of its members against a threat by the Soviet Union and its allies, but instead of celebrating our success, NATO today must confront a crisis that tears at the very fabric of that alliance.

At the heart of this problem is the fact that in Bosnia, NATO cannot act without the consent of the United Nations and its local representative. An inflexible, time-consuming dual military command structure also have proven to be an invitation to disaster.

The Armed Forces of the United States are the preeminent fighting machine in the world today. They are the best trained, best skilled, best equipped, and best led.

Mr. Speaker, the brave young men and women in the Armed Forces deserve better than to be placed under the command of foreign nationals acting on behalf of the United Nations in a faceless bureaucracy. That is why the National Security Revitalization Act is so important.

THE CRIME ISSUE LEADS TO THREATS OF PARTISANSHIP

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week the Republican Party put through a bill to change last year's bill providing prison construction funds. They said last week that we had given the States too much discretion and we needed here in Washington to tell the States more what to do.

Today and tomorrow they are going to put through a bill that is exactly the opposite. They are going to try to undo what we did last year regarding money for prevention and for police because they say it does not give the States enough freedom.

What is the common threat? Why were they for restricting the States last week and for untying the States this week? Because they fear that President Clinton and the Democratic Congress has this year succeeded, and they are desperately eager for partisan purposes to undo that success.

That would not be so bad if it were not for the consequences. In my district and in districts all across this country police officers have been hired for what they thought was a 3-year period under the Clinton plan of last year. For partisan purposes, the Republican program would disrupt that. It would say to the people who hire policemen and the policemen hired that they are not going to have the assurance of the 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, surely they can find other areas in which to express their partisan desires.

REPEAL RAMSPECK

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to end a powerful, but little-publicized perk associated with Congress. My bill will repeal the Ramspeck Act, which for 55 years has quietly allowed former congressional and judicial employees to burrow into the civil service—given priority consideration over all other applicants, and full seniority when hired—upon the retirement, election defeat, or

death of their employer, Today the Ramspeck Act is a 55-year-old solution to a problem that no longer exists—namely the hiring and retention of congressional staff. I think we all agree that we have hard-working, dedicated staff, and this is in no way meant to denigrate them or the work they do. But to give any applicant for a Federal job such preferential treatment is wrong—and I hope my colleagues will join me in working to end this practice which smacks more of who you know than how good a job you can do.

THE CASE AGAINST BLOCK GRANTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress made a promise to put 100,000 new police officers on our streets. Today, Republicans are ready to break that promise. The Republican crime bill does not devote a single dollar for cops on the beat. Instead, it creates block grants to the States, which may sound like a good idea, but we have been down this road before.

The last time we tried a similar block grant program for law enforcement, States used the grant money to buy land, cars for politicians, jet planes, financial investments, and to pay for consultants.

By contrast, the crime bill we passed last year is already working to put more police in our neighborhoods. My hometown of New Haven, CT, has nine new officers on the beat, already.

Our local law enforcement, our mayors, our chiefs of police, and our sheriffs have all thanked us for the cops on the beat program. Members of Congress have a choice to make today. Will you stand with law enforcement, or will you stand with the practitioners of politics-as-usual? Stand with the cops, pass the Conyers-Schumer amendment.

SUPPORT URGED FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act. H.R. 7 represents a vital statement of priority and policy for the future of this Nation's military.

H.R. 7 offers a much needed policy redirection in the area of U.N. peacekeeping operations. Too many Americans have experienced the painful costs associated with the ever-expanding peacekeeping role of the United Nations.

This country has raised and trained the most effective military machine the world has ever known. And yet, how can we allow our sons and daughters to be put under inferior command and control?

H.R. 7 restricts the President's ability to subordinate U.S. troops to U.N. command and control by requiring Presidential certification of such an arrangement and by restricting the funding required for U.S. forces engaged in U.N. operations.

We owe it to our military men and women to pass H.R. 7 and resist weakening amendments.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR THE CRIME PACKAGE WELCOMED

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, while in my congressional district this past weekend, constituents expressed both their pleasure and astonishment that elected officials were able to keep a campaign promise. Citizens appreciate the swift and successful manner which the crime legislation has passed through the House.

People appreciate the bipartisan support the crime package has and will continue to receive. They overwhelmingly support the new crime bill which: First, Controls the endless number of death row appeals; second, extends the good-faith measure under the exclusionary rule; and third, ensures that convicts serve at least 85 percent of their sentence.

Today, we will debate the Local Government Block Grant Act which grants local communities greater control in the battle against crime.

I can assure you that law enforcement, as well as the taxpayer, appreciate this help to fight crime. The Contract With America is helping to rebuild the public's trust in Congress.

WORLD STILL THREATENED BY NUCLEAR WEAPONS, DEFENSE REVITALIZATION NEEDED

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, the big lie has been spread over the past few years across this country that the world is a safe place to live in now than it was 5 years ago. Well, the fact of the matter is there are as many nuclear weapons in Russia today as there were before the Soviet Union broke apart, and in China they have the second fastest growing economy in the 1980's in all of Asia, and they are using their new found economic power to rebuild their military machine.

In the next 5 years it has been estimated that countries will have an intermediate range missile capability to launch nuclear weapons across continents.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in H.R. 7, a bill that not only will strengthen our national defense but finally take power away from the United Nations and return it where it belongs, back with the Armed Forces of the United States.

IN SUPPORT OF GIVING BLOCK GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FIGHT CRIME

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if President Clinton needs any proof that his crime bill is misguided, he only needs to look out the window right here in Washington, DC, where the police chief has come out in support of the Republican idea to give block grants to local government. He knows the truth of what Republicans have been saying for years—that Washington simply does not have all the answers. This one-size-fits-all approach to crime control is completely wrong and contrary to whatever disinformation or misinformation we may have heard from the other side of the aisle.

It is a very simple system. The local communities get to use this money for one of four purposes—more cops, more equipment, police in schools, or prevention. So they get to use this for prevention programs as long as they have law enforcement officers involved in them. The DARE Program will not go away. In fact, it is the perfect program that could be used in this way. This is something that ought to be supported. Clearly, it is being attacked by the President for the wrong reasons, and all he has to do is listen to Chief Thomas in Washington.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 521

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 521.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 118 on passage of H.R. 668, the Criminal Alien Deportation Improvements Act, I was unable to be here due to travel constraints.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea."

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 79 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 79

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

consideration of the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed ten hours. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 79 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995. This act authorizes a total of \$10 billion in direct block grants over 5 years to assist State and local governments in their fight against crime.

Specifically, the rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee. After general debate is completed, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period of time not to exceed 10 hours.

The rule makes in order the Judiciary Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as the original bill for purpose of amendment, and the committee substitute shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Once again, under this rule the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may give priority recognition to

those Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

Preprinting of amendments in the RECORD is not mandatory, Mr. Speaker, and no Member of this body will be denied the opportunity to offer his or her proposal during the time allocated under the rule for amending under the 5-minute rule.

The majority members of the Rules Committee recognize both the need for and the value of informed debate on important legislation such as the one we are about to consider today.

We strongly encourage Members to preprint their amendments in the future not only to receive priority status, but also to alert our colleagues as to the number and types of amendments that are likely to be offered on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 79 brings to the floor of the House the last of six comprehensive measures reported by the Judiciary Committee to combat crime in the United States. H.R. 728 is an especially important piece of legislation because it gets at the heart of the Federal, State, and local partnership, which is needed to effectively reduce crime, and reduce the threat of crime, in our society.

Mr. Speaker, while the Federal Government loves to take a high profile in the fight against crime, the overwhelming majority of crime falls within the jurisdiction of State and local authorities. As a result, the real burden of fighting crime falls preeminently to States and localities.

The challenge for us then, Mr. Speaker, is to define our role in such a way that we can productively assist localities in fighting and preventing crime without getting in their way, in other words, without micromanaging, as we are prone to do.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government does have a role to play in keeping our cities and communities safe from crime, but any support from Washington, be it financial or otherwise, must not lose sight of the fact that communities across the United States face many different types of crime.

What works to fight crime in my own hometown of Glens Falls, NY, may be vastly different from what is proven to be effective in Columbus, OH, or Sanibel, FL.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who supported the unfunded relief bill so fervently, earlier this month, did so because we fear that the vital partnership between Federal, State, and local governments is terribly off-balance.

That partnership—that critical relationship—between America inside the beltway and outside the beltway, is being threatened by the arrogance of power in Washington which presumes that the Federal Government is the only source of good ideas and practical solutions.

Too often, Washington's one-size-fits-all approach to a problem, or even a perceived problem, stifles innovation, and chokes off creativity at the State and local levels. In so many instances, Washington is all too eager to impose its will when a local problem can be more effectively addressed by a local solution.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 728 is the common-sense solution to restoring balance to the Federal, State, and local effort to confront crime.

Unlike last year's crime bill, this legislation allows the Federal Government to fulfill its role in assisting local governments in their fight against crime, without prescribing the specific steps which must first be taken, in order to receive much-needed Federal assistance.

Very simply, it provides localities with the resources they need to respond to their unique crime situations with their own solutions—with no strings attached and no matching fund requirements, I might add.

Let me just point out to my colleagues that this bill does not hand over a blank check to our communities, for them to spend taxpayer dollars in any way they see fit. While H.R. 728 delivers maximum flexibility to local governments, it also requires accountability, and ensures that grant funds are being utilized to fight crime.

Mr. Speaker, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act represents a real and meaningful commitment by the Federal Government to assist localities in combating crime.

By supporting this rule Mr. Speaker, we bring to the floor of the House of Representatives the final installment in the new Republican majority's comprehensive anticrime strategy.

And in so doing, we give life to one more crucial element in our Contract With America—our commitment to making our cities and neighborhoods safer, and more prosperous.

I urge adoption of this rule, and urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation so that local governments can have the freedom and flexibility they require to fight crime in their communities with their own unique solutions.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding the customary one-half-hour debate time to me, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman explained, this resolution provides a rule with a 10-hour time limit for the consideration of H.R. 728, the Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995.

While I shall not oppose the rule, we in the minority are concerned about the nature of the rule. It is not the type of rule the new majority continues to promise, especially for legislation as significant as H.R. 728, a piece of legislation that represent a dramatic shift in national policy.

The most significant restrictions that the Republicans on the Committee on Rules included in this rule is the 10-hour time limit on the amendment process. My colleagues should fully understand the implications of this restriction: The time limit is not applied to debate time only. It is instead a repeat of the device we first saw last week in considering another of the crime bills. This a restriction on all time, including the time required for voting itself.

This is, therefore, a constraint on debate during the amendment process and, in the opinion of this gentleman, an extremely objectionable restriction. Unfortunately, an attempt by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to strike this time limit, was defeated by the Committee on Rules last week.

Mr. Speaker, we are disturbed about the nature of this rule. It is a continuation of the pattern we already have begun to detect in the majority's attempt to deliver the open rules it has long advocated and promised, but rules that turn out to be truly open in name only.

The majority claims to be providing open rules when the result is, in effect, a process that closes down and restricts debate during the amendment process.

We are aware of the fact that the majority wants to complete consideration of all of the bills included in its so-called Contract With America within the first 100 days. And I suspect they will be able to do so. But some of these bills are, in fact, very major, very serious pieces of legislation, which should not be rushed. The truth if the matter is that we have all year to consider these bills and, if necessary, we could take a few additional days beyond the 100 to consider them.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. HYDE, said in his testimony to the Committee on Rules that this is, the "most controversial of the six crime bills being presented to us by the majority party."

So all we are trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is there is a better way of doing this than what we seem to be currently embarked upon. We are suggesting respectfully that we start consideration of these bills under an open rule, with no restrictions on time. If the proceedings drag on too long, if dilatory tactics are apparently being used, then we can do what we usually do in such circumstances, get unanimous consent that further consideration of amendments to the bill be limited to some specific period of time.

□ 1440

Let us not start the process with time restraints that might not be necessary or, to the contrary, might well prevent the adequate consideration of major amendments to the bill.

The bill itself, Mr. Speaker, is very controversial, certainly the most controversial element in the Contract

With America crime package. It seeks to dismantle the core of the bipartisan crime bill enacted last year by eliminating the program to put an additional 100,000 State and local enforcement officers on the beat and by eliminating virtually all of the specific crime prevention programs in the new law.

In place of these carefully targeted programs, the bill would establish a new block grant program which is strikingly similar to the program administered by the law enforcement assistance administration, which was finally eliminated by the Reagan administration.

As our colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary wrote in their dissenting views in the committee report on the bill, H.R. 728, the bill breaks the promise Congress made last year to the American people that we would put 100,000 new police on the streets to fight violent crime, and it also destroys the promise Congress made to our people when we approved carefully targeted crime prevention programs.

Unfortunately, H.R. 728 itself guarantees absolutely nothing in the way of increasing the number of police on our streets. It will actually cut spending for police and crime prevention. We are being asked to consider a bill that has a very real chance of wasting a good part of the \$10 billion cost of the bill to taxpayers with no specific goals up front and with no specific results to show in the end, and all in the name of flexibility. In fact, unlike the contract's bill on prison construction, which included very strong restrictions and requirements for use of the funds, this bill permits spending for categories so broad that there is no doubt that some grants will simply disappear into municipal budgets. That is exactly the history of the block grants program with the law enforcement assistance administration, which the Alabama State attorney general called "A politician's dream for the biggest pork barrel of them all." We are, all of us, confronted with some difficult choices in considering this bill. Most of us are all for local governments deciding what to do about crime or about education or about welfare, for that matter. But we are not all for voting on behalf of the taxpayers we represent to send money to other levels of government without knowing how it will be used. It is bad enough, it is often embarrassing, to find out sometimes that money we have voted for Federal programs has not been wisely spent, and it is worrisome and potentially irresponsible in the extreme to vote funds for local programs whose purposes are not even clearly set out in the legislation itself and whose use we will have very little control over.

Yes, in theory it is nice to give the responsibility to local levels of government, but it is we who are voting to make taxpayers' money available. And it is we who will and who ought to be

eventually held responsible, for the wise use of that money.

I am only suggesting that we may well be getting ourselves into a similar situation to the one in which we found ourselves with respect to the LEAA block grants which, as many Members will recall, we stopped funding a decade or so ago.

Mr. Speaker, the programs we enacted just last year have only begun to work. We should allow them to continue so that more police will be on the streets of our communities and more criminals are locked up.

To repeat, we shall not oppose this rule despite our continuing concerns about the use of the time limit on the amendment process.

I ask my colleagues to approve this resolution so that we may start consideration today of this important legislation and of the important amendments that would help correct its many provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I heard the word "pork barrel," the connotation that these local governments, these local police chiefs, these local sheriffs were going to spend this money in ways that were not important.

I would just like to read the part of the minority Democrat report on this bill before us. It says, "Proponents of this bill argue that these Federal dollars, taken from the taxes of hard-working Americans all over the land, should be showered back without meaningful guidelines, all in the name of local control. We say," this is the Democrat minority, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, "We say that mindlessly obstinate and ideologically inspired mantra," let me repeat that, because I doubt if the people I represent back home would understand that kind of elitist verbiage, let me go back and read it for a minute, "should be showered back without meaningful guidelines, all in the name of local control. We say that mindlessly obstinate and ideologically inspired mantra will result at the end of 5 years in billions of dollars being thrown down a rat hole."

Now, who said that? This is signed by the gentlewoman from Michigan, JOHN CONYERS, the gentlewoman from Colorado, PATRICIA SCHROEDER, the gentleman from Rhode Island, JACK REED, the gentleman from New York, JERROLD NADLER, the gentleman from California, XAVIER BECERRA, the gentleman from North Carolina, MELVIN WATT, the gentleman from New York, CHARLES SCHUMER, the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, the gentleman from Virginia, ROBERT C. SCOTT, and all but two, because one, I think, is a freshman, all of these but two, when they talk about money going down a rat hole, made the National Taxpayers Union's list of big

spenders. And I think they have made it for a number of years in a row.

For anyone to say that the local sheriffs and local police chiefs do not know best how to spend this money, believe me, they have been living inside this beltway too long. It is time they went home to outside the beltway.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], one of the most articulate and knowledgeable Members of this body. We are so fortunate to have the gentleman upstairs on the Committee on Rules; he is in the midst of his third career now. He was an Intelligence Agency officer for many years, he was a successful private sector policeman, and he now is one of the best Congressmen in Washington.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY, for that extraordinarily over generous introduction. I am petrified to say anything, lest it be disproved.

Mr. Speaker, what we have got in front of us is a modified open rule which actually has got a time limit on it, which is the only reason it is not a full open rule. It is a time limit of 10 hours of debate. The 10 hours of debate was thought to have been more than adequate by the Members who have brought this to the Committee on Rules for consideration, the type of rule we are bringing to the floor. And in fact, it was, I think requested pretty much by everybody, and we specifically asked if the chairman of the committee had an objection. He said, no, he felt it would be all right. So I think we are well within the spirit of an open rule, if not technically a full open rule, if it is modified.

We did have a lot of discussion, again, at the request of the chairman of the committee, and the ranking member. Excuse me, it was the ranking member who agreed that 10 hours would be enough as well as the chairman. And both the ranking member and the chairman themselves suggested that we have something like an hour and a half or so of general debate. Well, we had planned for an hour and a half but, in discussing this in the Committee on Rules, we brought that back to 60 minutes of general debate. Actually, on the motion of a member of the minority, because there was a feeling that we had taken care enough of the general debate in this and more time that way for amendments. And that seems a reasonable proposition.

So we have carved a rule here that has actually considered the time very, very carefully. And we think we have got one that gets as much time as we need focused on the areas that it needs to be, both in terms of general debate and in terms of amendments for all Members who come forward and deal well under the 5-minute rule. Once again, we have put in what we think is

the very helpful preprinting option. It is not a requirement. It is not a mandate. It merely allows every Member to tell us ahead of time what his or her amendment will look to the legislation. That allows Members to become acquainted with those amendments. It allows the proponents of those amendments to get some support for their amendments going. And frankly, I think it enhances the process of deliberation and helps us get better laws enacted when we understand what it is we are talking about. We have more time to digest them and we have the opportunity to ask questions of the proponents of these amendments that occur to us not at the last minute but through a deliberative process, after having reviewed what amendments might come forward.

Basically, I think it is better government.

I want to speak just for one second to the bill itself. In the Committee on Rules, we had some concerns from the ranking membership side on behalf of the ranking member about accountability. Are we somehow or other dodging accountability by going to these community development grants? And the answer, in my view, as member of local government, having graduated from local government to the Congress, if that is the right term, is that I do not think there was less accountability at the local level. I think that there was more accountability at the local level.

It is very simple. That is where the front lines are. When someone is down there and they are at municipal meetings or their country commission-type meetings, or state meetings, they generally have more people directly interested in the audience looking at them, eyeball to eyeball, and giving them their opinions, usually rather unrestrained.

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, I think I can honestly say I do not remember times when there is more interest in the agenda at the local level than when the sheriff is doing his annual budget, or when the police departments are doing their annual budgets in the municipalities. Those are the times when the scrutiny really happens. That is when you get the really impassioned testimony about crime, or need for more police on the street, or need for specific programs tailored to the individual requirements of the community, not the one-size-fits all mandates from the Federal Government which are so wasteful and so often so off target.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the question, the shibboleth that somehow there is no accountability in this program is not a valid observation. I would report further on that, Mr. Speaker, that in fact we have put in some safeguards to make sure there are report-back systems, there are monitoring systems, and, indeed, there is some built-in accountability and scru-

tiny under the legislation that has been proposed.

The other thing that I think needs to be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, is that we sometimes have mischaracterized what is going to happen, it seems, in this bill, that somehow or other all the police are going to no longer be on the beat. I have heard all kinds of hyperbole and exaggeration. That could not be further from the truth. What is going to happen is that locals who have a direct first-hand confrontational day-to-day existence with the criminal element are going to be able to take resources which they desperately need and put them right where they need to deal with the criminal element. I think that makes a lot of sense. I think it is a much better, more straightforward deal than saying, "We are going to give you a bunch of money to go out and hire some policemen for a few years, and then we are going to take the money away from you. Then you are on your own." You have created a false expectation, you have created a serious problem, a level that the local governments cannot sustain, and the only recourse they have is either to retire those policemen, those law enforcement officers, or to raise taxes, by and large.

We saw it with the CETA program. We saw it loud and clear. I was in local government at the time and I know we got left hanging out there. I am afraid that is what would happen if we did not fix this bill as we propose to do under this legislation.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, feel this is a decided improvement. While we have given it a great rule, so we will have plenty of debate on this and the other subjects that are certainly worth debating. I hope that, when all is said and done, that not only do we have the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] not opposing the rule, we appreciate his support, but we also have him not opposing the legislation. We will wait to see how the debate comes out.

I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Greensboro, NC [Mr. COBLE] who is not only a member of the Committee on the Judiciary but is also a member of the Subcommittee on Crime, and one of the very articulate members of this subcommittee.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] for his courtesy. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken very infrequently during this 104th session of the Congress, but I have done a powerful lot of listening. I think this must be, Mr. Speaker, probably the most loquacious legislative body in the world. A lot of my colleagues, and good friends thought they might be, I think they find complete ecstasy in the

sound of their own voices. I, conversely, do not particularly like the sound of my voice, as evidenced by my previous reticence, so I will be brief today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to section 11 of H.R. 728, and specifically to the advisory board and what constitutes membership thereof. Under the present prescription of the bill, members to the advisory board must be representatives from police or sheriffs, No. 1; a local prosecutor, No. 2; a local court, No. 3; the public school system, No. 4; and a local community organization, charitable or otherwise.

In that fifth category, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be advisable for someone subsequently to seriously consider the input of the various parks and recreation departments throughout the country. To begin with, parks and recreation officials serve an essential component of any crime reduction strategy, as well as being uniquely cast in their respective communities to be able to attract the generated assistance from the private sector, financial and otherwise. The reason I emphasize this second feature, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that every program that surfaces necessarily has to be sanctioned, endorsed, subsidized by the Federal Government, which, of course, means subsidized by taxpayers.

I met last week with officials from parks and recreation facilities throughout the country, and perhaps other Members did as well, and they are vitally interested in this.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, as the day advances, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who has replaced the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], I may want to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida to indicate the importance of the input of parks and recreation, and perhaps maybe have language or a statement of the managers in conference to emphasize and to illustrate the significance of the input that would be felt if parks and recreation officials are to be considered.

I realized that they are not precluded under the present bill, but neither are they specifically identified, Mr. Speaker. Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, and again, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] for his kindness, I hope that parks and recreation people, who do contribute very obviously to reducing crime, will get more than a fair shake as we finalize this bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will say that Members may not hear from me again for some time to come, but I assure the Members I will be listening.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask for a record vote on the rule before us, but I was very tempted to do so, because this is not an open rule.

It is interesting to me that the majority now considers a rule that lets some amendments come up and not others as an open rule. This rule requires all amendments that have not been taken up by the House within the time limit of 10 hours, they are no good. Members cannot bring them up. That is a closed rule, Mr. Speaker. That is not an open rule.

It is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, that, I think it is today, even Roll Call has caught it. Roll Call even points out that the Republicans are not doing what they said they would do in the Contract With America. They said "We will have an open rule." They said we would be able to offer our amendments. Now, lo and behold, they are not doing it on this bill, and they did not do it on a previous bill.

Why are they not doing it on this bill? It is very obvious to me why they are not. If Members read this dog, and that is what it is, or a turkey, that is a better description, maybe, of it, we will find that the gentleman that earlier talked about this rule and the bill, they were talking about how our police chiefs and how our sheriffs back home were going to be able to get this money and use it to fight crime.

Mr. Speaker, Members had better read the bill. This means the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE], when he was talking on the rule about all the debate that is going on in the House and all the things he is hearing and everything, I suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina, he had better start reading the bills. He could spend time a lot better.

When Members read this bill, there are several things in it that I do not believe anybody has really talked about yet. I hope we discuss it in this 10 hours.

One is, a sheriff does not get to get the money. The police chief does not get to get the money. It is a unit of local government that gets the money.

Now, what input does the police chief or sheriff have in it? Each unit of local government has to have an advisory committee to the local government, and they have to have at least one hearing, and they have to have a meeting.

There is the sheriff there or the chief of police, and there is also a prosecuting attorney, there is a judge, and anybody else that the local government wants to put on it. There are a whole bunch of people. They can put 50 people on it if they want to, and there is one law enforcement official on there.

□ 1500

They are going to make a recommendation to the unit of local government. Well, after they make their recommendation, what can they recommend? Well, they can recommend

whatever their imagination can dream about that would help with law enforcement and fighting crime, because there is no limit. I want everybody to read right here on page 2 of the bill: "Amount paid to a unit of local government in this section shall be used by the unit for reducing crime"—that is a limit, has to be for reducing crime—"and improving public safety." That is all. As long as it is reducing crime or to improve public safety.

I can tell you back in my district, folks, that we have some people with imagination. Right now we probably need some courthouses fixed up and we do not have the funds for it. Maybe we can get some money to fix up the courthouses, especially where the prisoners might be kept. That could help reduce crime and combat crime. Or maybe we cannot get a new limousine under this bill but we can get a new chief of police car because that is not in the budget and they do not have the money to buy it but we can get him a new car. That can be a Cadillac, or maybe just a Chrysler Fifth Avenue, not quite a Cadillac. It will not be a limousine.

How about the prosecuting attorney back home—that is what we call them, we do not call them district attorneys, maybe you do—but some of them may need new secretaries. They may need, say, an assistant prosecutor, and that is not in the budget, it is not supplanting funds, so we are going to hire some new secretaries and we are going to hire some other people. And maybe need some new equipment in there and get some new equipment in there and get some new equipment.

For those of you who have a lake or two in your State, I am sure you can get some boats on that lake to help fight those people going around in those boats that are drunk. That is combating crime. Is driving a boat while drunk now a crime? It is in some States, quite a few. You can get yourself a nice boat, as long as it is not a yacht under this.

Use your imagination, folks if this bill ever becomes law. Use your imagination, because the only restriction is it has to so-called be reducing crime and improving public safety.

What did that do under the old program that we got rid of because of all the pork and all the abuses in it? Well, back then some people thought that a tank was a good thing to have, to use a tank to reduce crime. The director's office, different people, same office, said that was fine to reduce crime. You need a tank down there, I think it was in Louisiana. They need that tank.

I know we are prohibiting yachts, but we are not prohibiting any kind of boats. We are prohibiting limousines, but not every good car has to be a limousine. That means I could buy, how about a Jag? Yes, that is not a limousine. My police chief needs a Jag. That is what this one will do. That is what you are going to do under this.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. It has been fascinating listening to the statement that my friend the gentleman from Hannibal has gone through here. In fact, the only thing that I could conclude is that those local elected officials who are going to be purchasing Jaguars, boats on lakes, additional secretaries for their prosecuting attorneys' offices are no longer accountable to the same people who sent us up here.

The only thing I can conclude is that there is in fact no desire on the part of local elected officials to respond to the pressing needs of crime that exist within their jurisdictions. Am I correct in concluding that?

Mr. VOLKMER. Oh, no, no, we are going to take care of those, too. I am just saying you do not restrict these other things. You do not restrict them at all.

You are saying as long as you are doing it to stop crime or, I will use your exact words again that are in the bill, right there at page 2.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would further yield, I will tell him exactly what we are trying to say.

Mr. VOLKMER. All it has to be is reducing crime and improving public safety. That is it.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would yield on that point, what we are trying to say is very simply that we believe, my State being 3,000 miles to the west of here, that the people who are on the front line are better equipped to make those decisions rather than those of us 3,000 miles away. It is not nearly the distance to Missouri, but obviously we are in a position where we are convinced that those local elected officials should have the opportunity to make those decisions for themselves rather than our dictating to them exactly what should be done.

I just met a few minutes ago with the mayor of Fresno, CA, who told me that he felt very strongly that the opportunity to have the choice made right there in Fresno rather than in Washington, DC, will go a long way toward dealing with the crime problem that they have.

I suspect that in the Show-Me State, they are going to be much better off making the decision for themselves rather than having us in fact dictate it to them. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. VOLKMER. I disagree. I do not think we have to dictate it.

Mr. DREIER. That is exactly what the status quo does.

Mr. VOLKMER. But I do think you can tighten the purposes up quite a bit more and narrow them quite a bit more than you have done.

What we have attempted to do and some of us feel that one of the major items facing this Nation, especially in our major metropolitan areas, is the

fact that they cannot afford the police that they need. They cannot afford the police that we need.

So you take the police away. You say, "Well, you can have an option," but you reduce the amount that can be used totally from the present law into this, what can be used for police, if every bit of this money in your bill was used for the police.

Mr. DREIER. We are not taking away the police.

Mr. VOLKMER. The biggest thing we can do you help undo, and you leave it open. The gentleman says, "They're not going to do those things."

Well, who bought the tank? Who bought the tank? The tank was bought by law enforcement people under the old LEAA grant. You are saying they will never do that again, they will never do anything like that? No?

Well, gentlemen, you should have been here back in the 1970's and early 1980's.

Mr. DREIER. I think my friend knows it is a new day and I suspect the local elected officials will not be doing that.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think this will be the first time I have ever debated on the House floor about the content of a rule. The Committee on Rules is one of those committees that is stacked pretty heavily in favor of the majority and generally when they decide on a procedural matter and that matter comes to the floor, it just kind of goes right through on a partisan vote. So in some respects it is kind of banging your head against the wall to come and speak.

I am not speaking generally on the content of this rule today but only on one particular aspect of it that I think my colleagues and the American public need to be aware of.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 10 hours of debate, they say. What they do not say very loudly is that included in that 10 hours is voting time. I think the American people need to understand what that means, because if there is a recorded vote on the floor of the House, every recorded vote takes 15 minutes. Under the Speaker's policy announced earlier he has extended that recorded vote to 17 minutes. So that if there are 10 votes, 10 amendments on this bill, then that is 2½ hours gone to voting on those amendments. If there are 20 amendments on this bill, that is 5 hours gone just in the time that it takes to vote on those amendments. So we are left not within 10 hours, as the majority would have the American public believe, but then we would be left with half of that time because all the rest of the time would be spent in the voting process, not in the debate process.

Mr. Speaker, I am on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I will tell you that we had over 20 amendments being offered in the Committee on the Judiciary on this bill. In that body, we do not even have one-tenth of the membership of the House of Representatives. There are 435 Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I just want my colleagues to do the basic arithmetic on this. If 2 percent of the Members of this House have a sufficient interest in this important bill to come and offer an amendment, that is over 10 votes, or approximately 10 votes.

□ 1510

If 5 percent of the 435 Members of this House have a sufficient interest in this important bill to want to offer an amendment, then we have already used up more than half of the 10 hours of debate time simply on the voting process.

So, my objection to the rule does not really have to do so much with the 10 hours, but the allocation of that 10 hours or a substantial part of it simply to the voting process.

And I will tell Members that last week we got to the point just to keep Members from offering amendments that they had on a bill, that they started asking for votes so that Members would not even have the time left to offer the amendments because the voting time would take up more time than the debate time.

America, that is no way to run a democracy. That is no way to run a democracy. We ought to at least have time to debate these issues. This is an issue, this is a bill that the President of the United States indicated over the weekend he has a personal interest in, a political interest in. So we know it is going to be a heavily debated issue, and yet we will spend our time walking back and forth and using up our time in the voting process.

I think we ought to defeat this rule and let us have some real debate in this House.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my friend whether he has any remaining speakers?

Mr. BEILENSEN. We do not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to make some closing remarks myself.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying I appreciate very much and strongly support the comments made by our friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this issue is one that many have said is the most controversial of the six crime measures that we are scheduled to consider and I have a difficult time understanding why this is the most controversial of the measures that have been considered, and I say that for several reasons. We have had this ongoing discussion here about the issue of local control, and the role that people will play at the local level in making determinations as to how the resources through this block grant program will be expended.

It seems to me that everyone, Democrat and Republican alike, needs to recognize that at the local level people who are on the front line dealing with issues of crime are much better equipped than we are here in Washington, DC, to deal with that.

Last year we had an extraordinarily vigorous debate on the President's crime bill which came forward. We all know that there was at the very end a compromise that was struck and some Republicans supported it, and during that time last fall as we were proceeding with this and the President stood regularly with cadres of police officers behind him at press conferences, I received calls from local elected officials in the Los Angeles area urging me to support the President's crime bill. The main reason they did was that there was a guarantee as far as they were concerned that they would get 100,000 police officers on the street, who would dramatically turn the corner on the very serious crime problems that we face in our communities.

One of those city officials happened to be the city manager of the city of Monrovia which is in the San Gabriel Valley part of the area I am pleased to represent. He is a registered Democrat. He and I engaged in a very spirited discussion on the issue of the crime bill and he told me that the only responsible thing that I could do was support that crime bill last year.

Well, I did not for a number of reasons, I think the most important of which was that we all concluded that we would not get 100,000 police officers on the street.

I got a letter that came just a couple of days ago, the end of last week from Rod Gould who is city manager of Monrovia, again a registered Democrat and one who wanted me to support that crime bill last year, and we had debated it. I will include this entire letter in the RECORD. But I would like to share one paragraph from this letter Mr. Speaker.

It says, "You and I have had several talks about the merits/demerits of the 1994 crime bill." He finally came to the conclusion we were right and he said,

"You correctly pointed out that this \$30 billion bill would not put nearly 100,000 police officers on the streets of America." He said, "The City of Monrovia strongly supports the idea of combining the major portions of the bill into block grants for cities to allocate as they see fit to officers, equipment, training, jails or social services. This approach has worked well for years in the area of community development, and it would be welcomed by municipalities across the country."

Mr. Speaker, I include that entire letter at this point in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CITY OF MONROVIA,
OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER,
Monrovia, CA, February 6, 1995.

Hon. DAVID DREIER,
Covina, CA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DREIER: I have been meaning to write and add my congratulations to you on your remarkable rise in authority and responsibility since last November. I have had the pleasure of tracking your progress in the papers and on CSPAN. You are to be commended for your tireless effort to streamline Congressional operations. Your leadership of the House debate on unfunded mandates made us all cheer. You have given your district in the San Gabriel Valley a powerful voice on the hill, and all Americans benefit from your undaunting attempts to reduce fraud and waste in government.

The Monrovia City Council is firmly on record as opposing further federal and state unfunded mandates. We are currently grappling with the open-ended stormwater requirements under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Any assistance you could give us in ratcheting this regulation back a few notches would be most appreciated by all cities.

You and I have had several talks about the merits/demerits of the 1994 Crime Bill. You correctly pointed out that this \$30 billion bill would not put nearly 100,000 police officers on the streets of America. The City of Monrovia strongly supports the idea of combining the major portions of the bill into block grants for cities to allocate as they see fit to officers, equipment, training, jails, or social services. This approach has worked well for years in the area of community development, and it would be welcome by municipalities across the country.

Thanks again for your ongoing concern and interest in local matters as you shape national policy and the federal governing structure.

Sincerely,

ROD GOULD,
City Manager.

That is the reason that I find it difficult to believe that this is the most controversial crime measure of the six that we are considering, because across this country we are finding a strong level of support from local officials.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, that quotation simply was from the gentleman's own chairperson, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], who said in his view this was the most controversial of the bills. It was not we who said

it; it was your own chairman who said so.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for pointing that out and I disagree with the chairman of the committee. I guess that was concluded because of the fact that controversy existed in the Committee on the Judiciary when debate proceeded.

All I am saying is that the controversy probably did not come from the chairman of the committee, it probably emerged from members of the Committee on the Judiciary who believe very strongly that Federal control on this issue would be more important than local control, and I believe that is why Chairman HYDE concluded it was controversial.

All I am saying is I am hard pressed to see why it is a controversial issue. And the reason I say it is that these messages have come through very clearly. Again, Jim Patterson, the mayor of Fresno, CA, was in my office about 1 hour ago and he talked about how important it is for us to move ahead with this block grant concept. And I hope very much that the controversy that existed in the Committee on the Judiciary will not exist here because I believe Members on both sides of the aisle, as I said, this Democrat city manager from Monrovia believes this is an important thing for us to pursue, and I hope very much that we can.

This is an amendment process which allows for open debate. To call this a closed rule, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] did I believe is really totally inaccurate because we will be operating with this 10-hour limitation under the 5-minute rule.

□ 1520

We are simply putting an outside time limit on the consideration for amendments. Any amendment that a Member has to offer that is germane will be able to be considered, and a Member can stand up and simply make that proposal here.

So we are proceeding with a very fair and balanced procedure, and I hope that we can bring about what people at the local level believe is necessary for them to turn the corner on this serious crime bill that we have.

I urge support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to understand what I think is the complicated parliamentary situation that we are in now. If the Chair

will bear with me, I have a series of inquiries.

Mr. Speaker, is it correct to say that whenever a committee reports a bill, the rules of the House require the report to include a detailed analytical statement as to whether that bill may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in our Nation's economy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire further whether the rules of the House provide a general exception for reports from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer is no. They do not.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my parliamentary inquiry, do the rules of the House permit the Committee on Rules to report a special order waiving the inflation impact requirement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Further, Mr. Speaker, am I correct in saying, however, that the rules reported from the Committee on Rules and adopted just now by the House did not waive the inflation impact requirement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Continuing my inquiry, if I may, the report on a block grant bill from the Committee on the Judiciary, House Report 104-24, does not discuss whether the block grant bill will have an inflationary impact on the Nation's economy. There is a section titled "Inflationary Impact Statement" on page 20 of the printed report. That section discusses the inflationary impact of the proposed constitutional amendment to balance the budget and, in fact, by the way, claims the balanced budget amendment will have no significant impact on the U.S. economy. Truly, Mr. President, this section in the entire report does not comply with the rules of the House, specifically clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI. Am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The report does appear to refer to another measure.

Mr. BEILENSEN. I do not intend to press the point of order. I am only trying to understand the parliamentary situation.

Am I correct to say that, because the Committee on the Judiciary violated the rules of the House and did not provide to the American people an explanation of the potential inflationary impact of the block grant bill, and because the Committee on Rules did not waive the requirement, because of this, could any Member now raise a point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If such a point of order were raised, the Chair would rule on that point of order at that time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if then the point of order were raised and it were ruled by the Speaker to be in

order, what would be the effect of that point of order? Would it delay the consideration of the block grant bill until either the Committee on the Judiciary fixed the defect in its report in a supplemental report or the Committee on Rules reported another rule waiving the requirement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill would be recommitted if the point of order were sustained. The Committee on Rules could report out a new rule dealing with the point of order.

Mr. BEILENSEN. I thank the Chair for his responses. I will conclude my inquiries, if I may, sir, by asking whether this is a unique or even unusual parliamentary situation? Because it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that so far in the 104th Congress, we are in this situation on almost every rule we have considered. On the unfunded mandates bill, a parliamentary inquiry established the committee report was defective, and the rule had not waived the point of order. On the balanced budget joint resolution, the rule, as reported, also failed to include the proper waivers to cover another defective report. When we pointed this out, the rule was amended on the floor. The rule on the Taos Pueblo Indian land transfer bill also did not waive the necessary points of order to fix a defective report. In addition, the rule did not allow for instructions in the motion to recommit, violating clause 4(b), rule XI. The point of order on the rule was not pressed when the majority agreed to amend the rule on the floor, and the rule on the Butte County land conveyance bill did not contain the waiver made necessary because the bill was reported out of the Committee on Resources without a quorum being present.

Here again, we are having passed a rule that failed to waive the necessary points of order to protect a defective report.

I thank the Chair for giving us the opportunity to ask these questions and will not press any potential point of order that may be available to us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman for his observations.

Pursuant to House Resolution 79 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 728.

□ 1525

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, with Mr. GUNDERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gen-

tleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to make the point initially that what we are dealing with here today is a bill which will consolidate two programs that were passed in the last Congress under one local community block grant system for \$10 billion.

Those programs were the President's Cops on the Street Program and the so-called prevention programs that were allocated in categorical grants last year. In both of those combined together, there was a total of about \$16 billion of a \$30 billion crime bill that passed this Congress and became law.

This bill would as I said, consolidate the prevention programs and the Cops on the Streets Program into a single community block grant program in the tune of \$10 billion to let the local communities decide for themselves how to spend the money that they receive under this block grant proposal, rather than having the Federal Government tell it.

I was very disappointed to hear the President's radio address this past Saturday in which he said should this bill go to his desk, if I heard him correctly, he would veto it, because he felt it would undermine or destroy the Cops on the Streets Program.

This is especially disappointing, because I recognize what I hope he will in time come to recognize, and that is there are thousands of high crime rate communities around this country, who will not be taking advantage and not be able to take advantage of the President's Cops on the Streets Program that is now law, because they simply cannot afford to do so, and there are also thousands of communities that will not find the so-called prevention grant programs that are spelled out by last year's bill, those kinds of programs which they can utilize and they will never apply for those programs.

Consequently, the only way to remedy that defect is by passing the bill that is before us today, H.R. 728, and getting the President somehow convinced to let it become law or sign it into law or have enough Members to override his veto, because it is only if we do that that we will provide the maximum flexibility to the communities, the cities and counties of this country, to decide on their own what they want to do with this money, whether that is hire a new cop or whether that is to pay overtime for police or whether that is to buy a new police car or whether that is to extend the prevention program of their choice, whether that prevention program is one that is labeled in one of those previous grant programs or not in order to reduce crime in those communities.

Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, if the gentleman is prepared to give an opening statement here at this point.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], chairman of the Crime Subcommittee. I will not take much time to explain the details. I would rather he would.

But I just want to say I as quoted as saying this is the most controversial bill. I want to make it clear that it ought not to be the most controversial bill, but it was treated as such in the Committee on the Judiciary by the furor of the resistance of the minority party in transferring any authority away from Washington, where apparently all wisdom resides, out to local communities.

This bill illustrates the philosophical difference between the two parties. Everybody wants to stop crime. Everybody is interested in doing something about the crime problem. But there we diverge. The Democratic Party thinks and acts and believes that Washington, DC, the Federal Government, must dictate down to the most minute detail how these funds are going to be spent, because Daddy knows best. That is a philosophical commitment they have had on welfare and almost every issue—that wisdom trickles down, if you will, one of their favorite phrases, when we talk about economics—from Washington to the local communities.

□ 1530

On the other hand, it is our belief, the Republican belief, that local governments know best, that government is best which is closest to the people, which understands the problems that are indeed local.

Somebody said once, a famous person, a famous Speaker of this House, "All politics are local." Well, a lot of crimefighting is local. People in Boise, ID, have different problems and different needs than people in New York City or Bangor, ME, or Pensacola, FL. We have a very diverse country. We have diverse communities, and each has different needs.

I was—I do not want to say shocked—but I was saddened to hear local government maligned on this floor earlier today, and even by the President, who assumes from the beginning that this is going to be pork, that local government officials are not concerned about local circumstances and fighting crime and adding to public safety.

It is our belief that local government officials are honorable people, they have been elected by their constituents, who live very close to them. They want to fight crime, and they can do it more effectively because they have superior knowledge. They are on the scene.

Now, it may well be that certain communities need after-school sports

programs, tutoring programs, neighborhood watch programs; to put more police in the schools, put metal detectors in the schools, put better weapons in the hands of their police, put more prosecutors in the courtrooms, build boot camps for first-time offenders, build drug courts, put more communities at ease by having community policing.

There is an infinite variety of remedies that can be applied to this exacerbating problem, but let us trust the local people to do it.

So, to assume in the beginning that they cannot handle it, that they are going to waste it profligately, on pork, is an insult, really. It demeans public officials in the myriad, thousands of cities and towns around this country.

We believe that the best government is closest to the people and most responsive to their needs. That ought not to be too tough to understand, but it is indeed a defining issue, one more defining issue between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

We trust local government, and I can assure you there are safeguards in this bill, advisory councils which involve the people. That is a great phrase, "We the People." I suggest that these advisory councils that will be looking at this money and looking at how it is spent will be composed of people in the community, law enforcement, education, municipal officials. And, they will see that the money, which, after all, are tax dollars and collected from the same long-suffering taxpayer; whether the money goes to the State or to the Federal Government, it is the same money, is wisely spent.

And so to assume in the beginning it is going to be wasted or spent for pork does a great disservice to local governments across this country.

I guess not only do we think Washington does not always know best, but we have more faith and trust in local government officials than does the minority party.

This is an important bill, a significant bill. It is going to help fight crime. It is going to give the flexibility to local government to meet their situations.

The mayor of New York, I was present in a room when he said, "I don't want any more policemen, I need technical help." That may be true in many areas. So let us let them decide, let them spend the money. We will be watching, the community groups will be watching, the advisory councils. If they misstep, it will not go ignored or unacknowledged, and it will be corrected.

So I am proud of this bill, I am proud of the work that the gentleman from Florida, BILL MCCOLLUM, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. SCHIFF, and everybody on our committee has done, and I hope it gets the support of a majority of this House.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strenuous opposition to the measure before us.

Before I get into some other remarks, let me just respond about the new-found trust that the majority party has in local government. We trust local government as well. As a matter of fact, we not only trust them, we listen to them. And when we listen to them, we listen to the policemen that they say we do not trust, the policemen that we are listening to in the Fraternal Order of Police, who say that the crime bill that divided out the prevention program from the Cops on the Beat Program was the way to go. The international Brotherhood of Police Officers, their chiefs and police officers, saw that the 1994 crime bill created a community police program of 100,000 policemen. That was what they wanted to do. The Major Cities Chiefs representatives, we just talked to them only an hour ago, and they again are here urging that we turn down this proposal that the Republican majority has dreamed up.

The National Association of Police Officials, police organizations, with Bob Colley, a 30-year police officer from Detroit, are all testifying 100 percent on behalf of the 1994 crime bill: namely a return to community police as a separate program and not put it into a block grant with prevention, so that we may not end up with the Hobson's choice of either prevention or police.

The National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Officers are strongly in support of the modification that we will shortly offer to keep 100,000 community police in a separate position. This shows we do not just trust our local government, we hear them and we trust them and listen to them and then act on that premise.

So the police officers organizations—and they represent the rank-and-file policemen and police chiefs—are for the proposal which we will shortly offer to restore 100,000 policemen in a separate program. The Sheriffs Association, the National Sheriffs Association, have our support, the Police Executive, the Police Executives Research Forum, has our support. former police chief Hubert Williams, of the Police Foundation, has our support.

There are eight police organizations, foundations, brotherhoods, all supporting the plan that we will shortly bring to restore the fundamental provisions in the 1994 crime bill that will create 100,000 community policemen. Funds for 17,000 new police have already been certified by the Attorney General and will shortly be on the beat, if they are not already.

Now, the Republican majority has replaced a prevention and COPS Program that we know works, with a 1970-style revenue sharing program that we know

has failed. That is why we are not supporting it. We had that experience. It did not work. This is the pork program that we do not want to have put into law.

Why are we doing this? The 1994 bill is only a few months old, it is working fine; let us continue and not create the incredible confusion that will result from having to pull it. The Republican program is \$10 billion worth of pork, and it will end up, I predict, in getting very few cops, very little for prevention programs, no guarantees for crime reduction, no money for the programs that mayors and community leaders tell us are needed to reduce crime, no accountability.

Mr. Chairman, this is a \$10 billion taxpayer giveaway that we are being asked to support; the formlessness of the block grant program is begging to be abused. We know the program will fail, because of our experience with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Program, which did not work 35 years ago.

The Members of this body should make no mistake, this block grant formula is nearly identical to the failure structure of the 1970's program. And what did it bring us?

□ 1540

Well, at one university a \$300,000 study to assess the need for a looseleaf encyclopedia on law enforcement; in one State, the purchase of aircraft used by the Governor and his family primarily for traveling. In another area, a national accounting firm was paid \$27,000 for a government manual that we later found already existed.

Mr. Chairman, it is a boon for consultants who, by the way, got one-third of the funds according to these surveys.

We have boondoggle after boondoggle that makes us know that the police chiefs, the Fraternal Order of Police Officers, the foundations, organizations, are all correct. We need to return to a separate category of community police, and that is what we propose to do.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, first of all, respond to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] on these comments about all these police organizations supporting last year's version and not supporting ours. We can all get down here and have litanies of who supports what and who does not. I do not know what good that does, but I can say that it is a split decision at this point if we add up who is and who is not on the list of them. For example, the National Association of Chiefs of Police strongly support our block grant approach as opposed to last year's cops on the street version, and that is also true of the Law Enforcement Alliance of America, it is true of the Memphis Police Association, the Southern States Police Benevolent As-

sociation, the American Federation of Police, the Police Superior Officers Association in Trenton, NJ; we have any number of individual lodges of the Fraternal Order of Police, though maybe their national office wants to go, and the board of directors, the other way; the Oklahoma Sheriffs Association.

I have right here in front of me a copy of a newspaper article recently where the chief of police right here in Washington, DC, says that he much prefers the version that we are going to offer because the city of Washington, DC, does not have the money or the ability to take advantage of the Cops in the Streets Program the way that the President has put it forward, but they could take advantage, and get some new police and some support for their police in this city of ours right here that we all know has such a very high crime rate, and the list goes on and on.

I do not think the debate today ought to be over how many police support which program. I think the debate should be on the merits of what is the better position, and I think clearly we have the better position. There are always going to be some communities that benefit more by this than others do. My own city of Orlando, FL, while its police chief and mayor strongly support our block grant program as a growth city, we are going to hire more police officers anyway and obviously get an advantage out of the President's proposal because he is saying, look, we will pay 75 percent of the first \$20,000 or \$25,000 each year for 3 years of hiring a new police officer, whereas another community, which was not, maybe, going to plan to hire them, like the city of Orlando, that finds that to be a very beneficial thing because it helps pay something they were going to pay for anyway. Somebody else would not find that to be the case, and in many communities, thousands of communities around the country were not planning to hire police, who now find themselves in the position of having to look at this in the cold, hard light of day and the dollars they have available, and they clearly cannot afford to do that.

We are going to hear a lot more about that over time. Let me describe briefly what H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grant Act of 1995, does.

Mr. Chairman, it is the last of six crime bills I introduced in connection with the Republicans' Contract With America. In many ways, it represents the central differences between the policies of last year's crime bill and the policies of the new Congress, and, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] our chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said a few minutes ago, in many ways it represents succinctly the differences in political philosophy between Democrats who controlled this Congress for 40 consecutive years and the new Republican-controlled majority. Republicans gen-

erally believe in government which governs best governs least. We believe in limited Federal Government. We believe government closest to the people, in the case that we are talking about here today, the cities and the counties of our Nation, are the best government for making decisions, and in this case that is precisely what this bill does. It delegates to those cities and communities around this Nation the decision-making authority to decide how best to fight crime in their communities, either with more cops, or prevention or whatever.

Last year's bill said Washington knows best when it comes to fighting crime. Local governments were offered more police, so long as they agreed to pay most of the costs for those additional police and to use them for community policing. Last year's bill also said that America needed billions of dollars in crime prevention spending, but only the kind of crime prevention that a liberal-controlled Congress favored. Well, Mr. Chairman, the American people, in poll after poll and at the ballot box, stated clearly their objection with that kind of so-called crime fighting strategy.

H.R. 728 before us today takes the opposite approach. It says that Washington does not know best when it comes to fighting crime. It says that local governments are capable of determining what their needs truly are. It recognizes that better than 90 percent of all crime is local and not Federal. It says that the President's cops project, created in the heat of presidential politics, is not beyond question, and that, if it is what America's localities actually desire, they will prove it when they spend their block grants that they get under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is a role for the Federal Government to assist the States in the fight against crime. But such assistance must appreciate that the problems vary from State to State and community to community. We must avoid a one-size-fits-all approach, even as we reject micromanagement. Support from Washington cannot come at the expense of flexibility.

H.R. 728 leaves to local governments the decision regarding what their funding priorities should be. It neither requires that funds be spent on police officers, nor on prevention programs, it leaves that decision to local governments, which understand their crime problems far better than we do. Under H.R. 728, localities can fund police on the beat, or prevention activities, or anything in between. The act simply requires that those funds be used to reduce crime and improve public safety.

At the same time, the act ensures that there will be fiscal and programmatic accountability as the funds are utilized. The opponents of local control argue that this act will become another LEAA. They cite horror stories from the 1970's when the Federal Government gave money go the States

which was then passed along to local recipients. But a fair and thoughtful examination of this bill that is before us today, should lead any unbiased observer to see that this is a new day and a new approach.

Under section 103, units of local government must submit an application which ensures that a local advisory board has been established and has reviewed the application. The advisory board's membership must include a representative from the local police department or sheriff's office, the local prosecutor's office, the court system, a local community group active in crime prevention, and a representative of the local public school system. This advisory board is an important way to ensure that a range of views are considered as localities' grant applications are being completed. The advisory board will further ensure a healthy dose of public scrutiny during the application process.

Section 103 also includes fiscal and accounting requirements to ensure that grant funds are properly managed. Moreover, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will be offering an amendment later today, to set aside up to \$60 million each year for oversight and accountability activities. There are many other differences between this initiative and the days of LEAA, and we will highlight those differences as the debate on this bill continues.

H.R. 728 repeals title I of the 1994 Crime Act, the public safety and policing section, and replaces it with a block grant program to provide funds directly to units of local government to assist them in their efforts to improve public safety. The use of grant funds includes, but is not limited to hiring, training, and equipping law enforcement officers and support personnel; enhancing school safety, and establishing crime prevention programs.

It is important to note that units of local government may use funds under section 101 for purposes other than those specifically identified, so long as they are used to reduce crime and improve public safety. The act provides maximum flexibility to localities while ensuring that funds are used to fight crime.

The act requires that grant funds supplement and not supplant State or local funds and there will be an amendment to the act to add a 10 percent match requirement to further assure that only the most worthy programs are supported by the block grants.

The bill authorizes a total of \$10 billion for the block grants over 5 years, with \$2 billion to be distributed in each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000. Units of local government can apply for funds each fiscal year. The formula for determining grant amounts is straight forward. It directs funds where they are most needed by taking into account the severity of crime and the population of a locality. Having examined the alternatives, I believe that the cur-

rent formula is the most equitable method of distributing resources, and that it keeps funding anomalies to a minimum.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 728 is precisely what the voters demanded on November 8. The majority of Americans said, "We want less government control coming out of Washington." They said, "We want government policymaking to be closer to the people where it will be more accountable to the taxpayers."

□ 1550

Finally they said that we do not want anymore expensive, unrealistic, pork programs coming out of Washington.

H.R. 728 meets those demands. It provides resources for localities to respond to their unique crime problems with their own unique solutions. Make no mistake, this bill will provide more money with greater flexibility to the vast majority of localities throughout America than last year's crime bill.

Also for those who might be concerned with what happens to the cops the President handing out money to some communities who can afford them in this fiscal year, they are protected and their funding for the full 3 years is also protected so they do not lose the opportunity for getting more police or the police that they have already gained. Some have said that we have obliterated that, and that is not true.

Mr. Chairman, the Local Government Law Enforcement Act of 1995 is an important way for the Federal Government to assist localities in dealing with crime without getting in their way. It is a rejection of the Washington-knows-best mindset that gave us the 1994 crime bill, and it provides far more resources for the counties, cities, and towns of America to develop home-grown solutions to their unique crime problems.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this crime bill is a very, very interesting issue, and for anyone watching this, it must be very confusing to hear one side saying one thing and the other side saying, "No, that's not right, it's just the opposite."

So where is the truth? I must say that I just came from a press conference where the Federal Order of Police, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the major city chiefs, the National Organization of Police Officers, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Sheriffs Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, and the Police Foundation had representa-

tives there saying that in order to retain the police that we got under last year's bill, we really should stand firm and vote against the one today.

I know we just heard the opposite, so what do we believe and where do we go? Not only that, but why is it so important to sort all of this out?

First of all, I tend to believe the people who are in the field, the police officers. Having been on the Armed Services Committee, I found the biggest mistake we have always made year after year is that we never talk to the people who are out there trying to implement the stuff; we only talk to the people here in Washington who are trying to sell the stuff.

Yes, there may be a few local cities that do not agree, but the tremendous ground swell across the country is that they prefer last year's bill which targets police officers. And then we hear people say in answer to that, "Well, why should Washington say that? Why shouldn't it be up to the localities?"

Well, one of the reasons it is not up to the localities totally is because this is a partnership and because really the localities are supposed to be taking care of crime anyway, and the only reason the Federal Government got into this is that the localities felt they were totally overwhelmed. So if the localities felt they were overwhelmed by crime and violence in their neighborhoods and in their cities and they said to the Federal Government, "Please, please send resources," and since we all know the Federal Government does not have a lot of extra resources to send, because we would do much better to do debt-sharing than revenue sharing, and not only is there the threat of crime but there is the threat of the debt, we would be very stupid to send money out with no strings attached. So if we are going to send it out, we felt we ought to be prioritizing what it had to be spent for and put it into things that people agreed upon were the most concrete and realistic approach. And the No. 1 thing everyone seems to constantly agree upon is that we need more police officers, that if we see community policing, that is when crime rates go down; if we see more police out there so that they are not under the strain and stress of overwork or whatever, we see crime rates go down. The cities tell us they cannot get more police because it is so costly. So that is why we targeted the money, and that is why they say we need to continue targeting this money. I think that is very important.

Now, most localities would spend the money very well if we did not tell them that. Many of them would probably hire cops, but there would be some that would not. That was our lesson of LEAA, and as we all know, they say those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it.

So the prior bill does not totally micromanage in any way, shape or form, but it does say, "If you want

Federal dollars, then you are going to get more police." I think that is critical.

There are other parts in this bill that I think we lost out on, and that I find to be very sad. One is community schools. We all know the saying that it takes a village to raise a child. Well, in most of our villages, everything has collapsed except the schools. The community schools grant under the prior bill was one that we had more applications for than anything else. People understand that. The schools are there. It makes sense to utilize them in a much broader sense. It certainly makes a lot more sense to do that than go to orphanages, for heaven's sake. If we can utilize these on a full-day basis or an evening basis or weekend basis to help lift young people up rather than just focus on locking young people up, it makes a big difference. So that community schooling item would be gone if we do not pass this through. In other words, the interest last year was to bring everything to the table and see what the things are that we really need, because we in the Federal Government are not sitting around here awash in surpluses, for heaven's sake. Yet crime is foremost on people's minds. If we are going to send this money to localities, we should put some constraints on it, not micromanage, but put constraints around it, and I think they have done a very good job of coming up with one-page forms that people have to fill out. That is all there is to it. It is not complex, but we want to make sure that when we spend the money, we get police officers, or that when money is spent, community skills are rebuilding so that they lock something into that community. And we want to make sure that the Federal tax dollars are being spent in ways that we know are very effective crime-fighting ways.

There is no better way to fight crime than with police. I think that is why most police officers in this country have been very supportive of the prior crime bill, and I think that is also why people have been supportive of the prior prevention balance that was put in there.

So I urge the Members to try to listen to this debate and ask, what would you do? If you were representing the Federal Government and you were representing a Treasury awash in red ink and you are now going to share some of this money with communities because they say they are under siege, do you not think some direction should be given? Should it be totally to "go and spend it well. We know you won't mess up?"

Most of them will not, but some will, and if they will, we will all get condemned and people one more time will not believe that the Federal Government can do anything well.

I thought last year's bill was the perfect balance, or as perfect a balance, I guess, as one could have. I would just

hope that we can leave that in place because I think to take any of the strings off, to cut the strings off and say, "Here it is" at a time when we have such debts would be something most people would be a little leery of and would say, "Why don't you just keep the money in Washington, then, and deal with the threat of debt rather than the threat of crime?"

I think this makes sense, and I would hope the Members would proceed on that basis and support the bill as we know it and as it is going forward, since police officers find that it is working very well.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 728.

Last Saturday President Clinton in his weekly radio address came out strongly opposed to this bill, saying that it would do away with the commitment that he and Congress made on the 100,000 cops on the beat that were promised in last year's crime bill. Unfortunately, the President is sorely misinformed on how much money is available in his own crime bill, and I believe he ought to apologize to the American people for spreading such misinformation around.

□ 1600

Let us look at the numbers in last year's crime bill and what is proposed in H.R. 728, and the American people will see that H.R. 728 has the potential of putting more cops on the beat than the crime bill that President Clinton signed into law last year.

Last year's crime bill provides \$8.8 billion for community policing over a 6-year period. That is \$1.47 billion a year. If the President says that that will pay for 100,000 police on the beat, that means that there is an average Federal payment of \$14,700 per police officer.

The average cost of a police officer is about \$70,000 a year, including the training and equipment expenses, as well as the expenses of hiring a new employee. That means that only about 21 percent of the total commitment of 100,000 cops on the beat will end up being funded by the Federal Government. So 21,000 cops is in the Democrat crime bill, which is a far cry from the 100,000 that the President and the supporters of last year's crime bill are claiming.

If you put it another way, if you subtract the Federal funding of the \$8.8 billion from what it would cost to put 100,000 cops on the beat, the local communities will have to come up with \$33 billion more in property tax revenue in order to put that number of police officers on the beat.

So the numbers that the President talked about simply do not add up, and I think that he and those who are using the 100,000 number ought to withdraw those claims quite promptly, because

the money from the Federal Government simply is not there.

Now, with all of these figures on the table, why is H.R. 728 a better approach? First, it increases the block grant for police to a potential of \$10 billion over 5 years. It takes away the strings that local governments have to put property taxpayers' money into paying for some of those expenses. The \$10 billion a year is on the assumption that the local communities would spend all of the Federal money on more police and none of it on prevention programs, such as midnight basketball and prisoner self-esteem.

Second, it is the local communities that decide how this money should be spent. What is true in New York City and what the needs are in Detroit is not necessarily what the needs are in Menomonee Falls, WI, or Orlando, FL, or some districts that are completely rural.

The beauty of block grants is that each community makes that determination for itself following a review of the advisory committee that was outlined by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Now, I think that the advisory committee and the types of public hearings that have to be held before the actual expenditures are made is the perfect check against money being wasted by local government. But even if it is, that determination can be made by the voters in each local jurisdiction when they go to vote to reelect their mayors or town chairmen and their council members, because come election time, the mayor that has fettered away Federal law enforcement funds on things that do not make any sense at all would be hard pressed to explain to the voters of his or her community why the decision was made.

So that accountability and that responsibility to the voters of a particular community is the best check against the dissipation of the Federal funds to things that are not effective that there is.

Let us face it: Press and public scrutiny of government decisions at all levels of government is much stronger now than it was during the terrible years of the LEAA. I want to put my faith in local government. This whole question and this whole debate is a question of money and a question of control. I think that local government will do a much better job in spending this money wisely than keeping the control in Washington and the U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I represent a city in my First Congressional District in Connecticut, a city that has very many exciting things about it. But like many cities in this modern day, we have some terrible problems.

Two years ago the problems really became much worse. We had the invasion of three different gangs, and the people in our town became very worried, not only worried, they became frightened. We had drive-by shootings; we had car hijackings. We had situations where people were thought to be somebody else and got shot.

Understandably our citizens remained disturbed, and people like myself who pretend to have some answers and hold ourselves out as elected officials who should be able to help, were equally disturbed. I really wondered what to do next. How could I help?

But something very positive happened and that was the crime bill we passed last year.

There were three things in that crime bill that held out hope to the people of my city. The first thing was additional cops. In that bill the cop program provided additional police for city streets. We had done other things. The Governor had sent in the State police, but that was so expensive it could only last a little while. We had a Federal crime task force, very needed, still going on, but people could not see these results quickly. They could see additional police in the streets.

The second thing that the crime bill did was it allowed preventive programs. Anybody who understands what was happening could see that these gangs are made up of very young individuals, and if we did not have alternative activities for these young individuals, they would go into the gangs.

So these preventive programs endorsed by everybody in law enforcement could be part of a solution to fight gang violence. We should keep those preventive programs so there is hope for the next generation. These activities not only included group sports but activities that help young people to stay in school and resist peer pressure.

The third thing we had in last year's bill was the concept of community policing. You have additional police, and where do you put those additional police? You put them on the streets of the individual neighborhoods. You put them where people can see them. You put them where people can talk to them. They get to know the neighborhood, the neighbors get to know them. When crime occurs everyone including the police know what is happening.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we passed last year was a good bill. I think we should keep that bill. It gives people hope that gang violence can be addressed and our cities can survive as safe places in which to live.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this weekend the President of the United States said, obviously referring to this bill, H.R. 728, that he would oppose, perhaps veto,

any bill that would jeopardize the number of police officers that would have been provided to communities under the bill that was passed last year.

I have two responses. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this bill could provide even more police officers than were provided in the last crime bill. The fact of the matter is that this bill offers total flexibility between police programs and prevention programs to the communities, unlike the highly structured bill that was passed last year.

If the issue is police officers, then communities are free to use all of the money under H.R. 728 for the sole purpose of hiring police officers. This will generate more police officers than could ever be provided under the bill that we passed last year.

I think the real issue, and this is my second point, is not the number of police officers; it is micromanagement. In the crime bill as we passed it last year, for the police programs, for the prevention programs, are paragraph after paragraph and page after page of how to run your communities if you want to apply for these grants, and that is really the issue here. The crime bill passed last year sought to micromanage from the Congress and from the Federal Justice Department how communities are running their activities.

We recognize that a large share of fighting violent crime is at the local level, and therefore we tell the local governments use the funds as you think best, and you do not have to fill out a long application to Washington explaining to them in advance how you are going to set up programs that you think benefit your communities first. That is why, Mr. Chairman, the House should pass H.R. 728.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that this last part of the crime bill is probably the most important part of the crime bill that is before us, and it will determine, without any doubt, whether there is real balance in the bill. We have done the prisons part of the bill already. Many of us are worried even though we stand for the proposition that there ought to be tougher and increased sentencing, that the money will not go there and do it.

Now we have the same type of worry from the opposite end on these parts of the bill, because the block grant proposal that is part of H.R. 3 is unfortunately so wide open that just about anything can happen. Read the language and you will see that the money can be spent on anything at all.

□ 1610

If we stand for one thing in this crime bill, if we stood for one thing in 1994 and should stand for one thing in 1995, it is, no matter what else happens, there ought to be 100,000 new cops patrolling the streets. Cops are good for prevention and for punishment. In the whole crime bill last year, there were

many on the left who objected to the prevention parts. There were many on the right who objected to the punishment parts. There were many on the right who objected to the prevention parts. But no one objected to the cops. And yet the Republican proposal in one fell swoop says, there may be 100,000 cops or there may not be 100,000 cops. That is their basic problem.

Similarly, the Republican proposal has no guarantee of any type of prevention or of all types of prevention. The block grant is so wide that unlike the crime bill that is now law, money could go to the wildest and craziest prevention schemes. My colleagues, the basic problem with the proposal is that when we give a block grant, we are never certain where the money ends up. Some of it ends up in worthy purposes, but much of it is either wasted or spent on purposes the Congress, the taxpayers never, never envisioned. So there is a serious problem.

Tomorrow morning I will be offering an amendment that guarantees the 100,000 cops, along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS]. That amendment will probably be the most important amendment in terms of crime fighting that any Member of this body will vote on for this entire Congress. This evening we will have some amendments that talk about keeping the prevention programs and some of the specific prevention programs, like drug courts and community schools that make a great deal of sense.

But the bottom line is this, my colleagues, do we want prisons and police and prevention or do we want pork? Because all the cries of last year that there could be pork in the crime bill will be hollow cries if this amendment is not agreed to and if the bill passes. Because there is no antipork provisions in this bill. We tried to put them in. We tried to put certain limitations without imposing mandates on the localities. But they are not there.

Is it any wonder that every major police organization supports the Schumer-Conyers amendment? None at all. Because, again, they know the money will go to police. And the police are what the American people need above all.

In conclusion, I would say to my colleagues, do not march in lockstep. The contract is doing pretty well. We have passed a lot of provisions, but we know that it is a lot better to guarantee the police than let local government spend it on sometimes good purposes but sometimes misused purposes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me say that I stand here in this well as a Republican Member that worked in support of the crime bill that was passed by Congress last year. I thought it was a good crime bill. I

stand here today, Mr. Chairman, because I believe this is a much better crime bill.

When we talk about the law enforcement block grant sections that are under discussion today and will be voted on through today and tomorrow, I believe that that local discretion that we give our municipal leaders and our police commissioners is vitally important.

Let us be honest about things. In many cities such as my own, our mayor came and said that this money would not be used under the old crime bill to hire one additional police officer for the city of New York. Because after 5 years, when the Federal subsidy ran out, he, we, simply could not afford to continue that funding. Instead, he would use it as was allowed by the—

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, is the gentlewoman aware of the provisions that the mayor of our city fought for for permanent computers, permanent replacement that would keep cops on the beat long after the 5 years?

Ms. MOLINARI. Absolutely.

Mr. SCHUMER. Then, how can the gentlewoman say that New York, that her city, my city, the city we love, would not get cops after 5 years? The very provisions we wrote in the bill would make sure that they get cops for all the years this computer system is working.

Ms. MOLINARI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a bit misleading to the American public who believes that under the crime bill passed last year that the city of New York would be able to go out and in fact bring on more police officers to the city of New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. That is exactly what will happen under last year's crime bill, according to the mayor.

Ms. MOLINARI. What it does is, it frees up the police officers. It does not add new police officers. Let me just say that the mayor of the city of New York has that very same discretion to utilize those funds to accomplish the very same purpose and, more importantly, additional purposes.

Something that was left out of last year's crime bill, in terms of the allowable uses of funding for officers such as the city of New York, would be that police officers who can be hired and trained now could be used to enhance school security measures and establishing crime prevention programs that may include things like citizen patrol program, sexual assault and domestic violence programs, programs intended to prevent juvenile crime, using our existing police officers to expand their abilities to deal with the growing and different trends of crimes in our streets and particularly in the city of New York.

I think this is a very valuable allowable use of crime prevention funds that

will enable our police officers, maybe not to add an additional person, although I do not think last year's crime bill will have added an additional person, but to allow those police officers to accomplish their jobs in a much more professional and dedicated manner.

I offer my wholehearted support to these improvements made in this particular area of the crime bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would ask the gentlewoman, is she aware of the provisions in the existing crime bill?

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, yes, I am.

Mr. SCHUMER. Could they not do all of the things the gentlewoman talked about?

Ms. MOLINARI. I think that is debatable.

Mr. SCHUMER. Why? What is debatable about it?

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the language in last year's crime bill does not specify that we have a better opportunity of getting these grants if we can put forth a program that shows, for example, that this money would be used toward training police officers in domestic and sexual abuse.

Mr. SCHUMER. The gentlewoman is absolutely unfortunately correct. Specific provisions in last year's crime bill that the mayor of New York City sought would allow training of police officers and other types of things.

Ms. MOLINARI. The exact language is the grants may be used to procure equipment, technical or support systems or pay overtime.

Mr. SCHUMER. Exactly, that is in last year's bill as well as this year's bill.

Ms. MOLINARI. That was in last year's bill. That does not extend to this year's bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. It does, indeed, because this year's bill is even broader. It could be spent on those purposes. Would not the gentlewoman admit if New York City would not want to spend an additional nickel on police of any sorts, that that would be permissible under the present proposal, but it would not be permissible under the present law, last year's proposal; is that not correct?

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that under this current crime bill, the city of New York has tremendous flexibility to deal with the problems that are affecting the city of New York. If my colleague will recall, our mayor stood here and said midnight basketball is a valuable prevention program. Many of the colleagues from other areas—

Mr. SCHUMER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what I would simply say here is, very simply, that our bill, and

I do not think the gentlewoman has contradicted this, despite what she is talking about, midnight basketball, our bill would allow the money to go for many police uses. The existing proposal would not require any money to go to police. It could well be that not a nickel would go to police. There in lies the difference.

Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], a member of the committee and the subcommittee.

□ 1620

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a lot of motivation has been ascribed to some Members of the minority as to the furor over this bill. I want to make it clear that my furor is focused on the cut of \$2.5 billion from prevention and police, where it can make the most difference in responding to the problem of crime. We have debated whether or not the local government or the Federal Government will decide how the money will be spent. We have had examples of local law enforcement block grants with LEAA, but I want to make it clear that my personal furor is over the \$2.5 billion that the communities will have less to deal with.

We have seen drug courts which operate at one-twentieth of the cost of other programs and result in an 80 percent reduction in crime. We will have less money for those programs. We have seen community policing, very effective in reducing crime. Police officers have been put on the street as a result of last year's bill. We will have less money to do that. Prevention programs, reducing crime, less money to do that. We have heard of some organizations supporting the bill. We have not heard whether or not they support the \$2.5 billion cut.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would restore the \$2.5 billion so the communities will have more money with which to fight crime.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join my colleagues in opposing H.R. 728, the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Act, and in supporting the Conyers-Schumer substitute which will be debated later this evening. The streets of my district, the Third District of Connecticut, are safer today because of the 1994 crime bill. Streets are becoming safer across this country because we are putting more police officers on the beat.

Mr. Chairman, last weekend I met with local law enforcement officials

and mayors in my district. They reiterated their support for community policing, and they asked me, "Why are you unraveling this bill? It is working. Give it more of a chance to work." The 1994 crime bill was passed and signed into law just last August. It is not even into effect for 6 months. They regard this as a bill that has already provided funding for 32 additional officers in 10 municipalities in my communities. They were united in their support for the course of this landmark legislation, and the course it has charted. The 1994 crime bill struck the right balance between prisons, police, and prevention. The bill was tough on criminals, as it should be, but it also recognized that the best way to deal with crime was to prevent it from happening in the first place. That means more community policing, more cops on the beat.

The 1994 crime bill guarantees that 100,000 more police will be on our streets by the year 2000. The Republicans' bill does not guarantee that even one new police officer will be hired over the next 5 years. Without the kinds of guidelines that were included in the 1994 bill's block grant programs, there is no guaranty that State and local officials will ever spend any resources in support of community policing and cops on the beat.

My police chiefs reminded me of prior law enforcement block grant programs that did not have guidelines, the kind we are talking about in the 1994 bill. They told me that they saw spending on cars for politicians, airplanes, and cash for consultants; even, I might add, armored tanks. The Conyers-Schumer substitute would restore funding that the 1994 crime bill promised the States and localities by putting back money into the Cops on the Beat Program. This was a promise that was made to the American public. I urge my colleagues to support our police and our communities by keeping our commitment to the cops, keeping our commitment to this program, programs that are making our streets safer, and the people who live in our communities feel more safe. Take a stand in support of our cities, our police, and our youth, Mr. Chairman, and support the Conyers-Schumer substitute.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair advise me how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the other side that we have no other speakers other than myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has the right to close, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] would then be recognized, if he seeks recognition.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, let me speak for a minute or two about what this debate and this bill is not about, and then talk a little bit about what it is about.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard in this debate that this is about whether the local government has control of this situation or whether the Federal Government has control of the funds. I think the debate that we will engage in shortly, Mr. Chairman, as we try to amend this bill, is about what will be effective in the crime-fighting context.

If we really think about it, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen any local government official or State government official who would refuse funding from the Federal Government, whether it has some strings attached to it or whether it has no strings attached to it.

If we ask a local government official "Would you rather have money that does not give you any guidance about how to use it," they will say "Give me the money." If we ask that same local government official "Would you take some money that gives you some guidance about how to use it," they will say "Give us the money. We need the money because we have a crime-fighting problem."

Therefore, the real issue here is not about whether we give the money to the local government, with some constraints or guidance, or no constraints and guidance. It is about having some mechanism for accountability.

Mr. Chairman, the real issue, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] has indicated during the course of this debate is whether we are going to have some programs that are dedicated to prevention and some programs that are dedicated to putting additional police officers on the street.

By knocking down the wall between the prevention programs and the police programs and saying we are just going to give you block grants, not only do we give more discretion to the local officials, and they will love it and say "Thank you; we do not want you to tell us anything about how we should use these funds," but what we are also doing is eliminating the opportunity we have for accountability for those funds at our level.

Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to build in some accountability in this process. My point, Mr. Chairman, is that we should have had in the last crime bill and we should have in this bill a process for evaluating and forcing local government officials, or if we retain last year's programs in place, the Federal Government, to have an evaluation process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 1 minute.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1630

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, if I have ever seen a piece of legislation that might be a candidate for a veto, I think the block grant is it. I think replacing 100,000 policemen on the street and a prevention program that works versus a \$10 billion giveaway with no guarantees that takes \$2.5 billion out of prevention is the wrong way to go and is likely to run into great difficulty with the Clinton administration.

The amendment that I am going to offer with my colleague from New York and many other Members supporting would effectively strike the block grant program, replace it with the bipartisan police and prevention package that we had in the last bill and won the support of Governors, mayors and, yes, law enforcement officials at the local level.

So rather than cutting the authorized amount to \$10 billion, it would fully authorize the two packages at \$12.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, if I've ever seen a candidate for a veto, this block grant is it. It replaces 100,000 cops on the street and prevention programs that work, with a \$10 billion giveaway that has no guarantees to cut crime.

Our amendment would effectively strike the block grant, and replace it with the bipartisan cops and prevention package, that has won support among Governors, mayors, law enforcement officers. Rather than cutting the authorized amount to \$10 billion, it would fully authorize the two packages at \$12.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, interestingly after all is said and done in this debate, three things remain clear:

First, the Republican majority has not told us how this block grant differs from LEAA in the 1970's. What specific guarantees exist in the text of this bill to ensure against the enormous waste we experienced with LEAA?

Second, not only has the Republican majority refused to tell us how this differs from the failure of LEAA, it has refused to identify any experience that is more compelling than the date of the authorized prevention programs. They have not responded to the empirical data—such as the California study, the data on drug courts, or early childhood intervention—all of which show us the promise of these programs;

Third, the Republican block grant will not guarantee a single new police officer. Our amendment here will guarantee the promise of both 100,000 new cops and smart programs that ultimately reduce tax expenditures rather than waste them.

This is a choice between making every American safer by putting 20 percent more police on our streets—or putting every American's pocketbook at risk with a 100-percent federally funded giveaway of \$10 billion. A choice of a prevention package written on the past 20 years of experience at the local level, or a block grant that failed 20 years ago. Let's

not go back to failed policies of the past. Let's move forward in the 1990's with programs that we know will work.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the debate that we are now commenced in that will run over the better part of 10 hours today and tomorrow is offering the most striking difference to the American people between the two parties that we have had in a long time on the floor of the House.

Republicans basically believe in limited government, believe in a local block grant program for the crime prevention and the police opportunities that we have to fight crime, and the Democrats have always believed in the Federal Government knows best and that is what was in their crime bill last year.

We have a real opportunity to make a difference here when we vote on the local crime bill programs that we are offering out here in the next day or two. What is good for New Brunswick, GA, is not the same as what is good for Sacramento, CA or Madison, WI. The local communities know best. They should make that decision. That is what this debate is all about. We are going to decide that out here. I trust when it is all said and done, this Congress will give the right to the local communities to fight crime as they see fit, to make the decision of whether they want a new cop or whether they want a prevention program and to make sure that every community with a high crime rate in this country can participate and not exclude some as the present law does.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express numerous concerns about H.R. 728. At the outset I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, for their efforts over the last week to improve these so-called crime bills that our Republican colleagues have brought to the floor. They have raised many important issues which have not been given proper consideration by the other side in their rush to bring bill after bill to the floor in order to meet an arbitrary 100-day deadline.

H.R. 728 is the final blow to the most comprehensive crime fighting legislation ever passed by Congress. The Crime Bill struck a smart balance between punishment and prevention. It had the support of police, local officials, Governors, community leaders, teachers, recreation directors, and many others across the country. Most importantly, it responded to the calls of the American people for safer neighborhoods by establishing a grant program to put 100,000 new police officers on our streets. Thanks to Herculean efforts by the Justice Department, funds have already been directed to thousands of communities, large and small, to hire approximately 17,000 new police. Importantly, these officers will be involved in community policing. Community policing has been proven successful over and over again in reducing crime and improving relations between law enforcement personnel and residents. Almost nothing works

better to deter crime than having officers highly visible in the community.

I say almost nothing because stopping crime from ever occurring works better than anything else to make our communities safe. By taking steps to address the root cause of crime—drug abuse, lack of educational and economic opportunity, and the decline of the family—we can prevent it from occurring in the first place. The Crime Bill took this proactive approach by allocating a small portion of the funds available to local communities for a wide range of worthwhile initiatives. Funds would be available for education, job training, anti-gang programs, drug treatment and after school and summer activities. Importantly, the bill did not impose solutions or program designs on communities. Instead, it provided broad discretion to communities to develop programs to meet their particular circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 728 will change all of this. It guts the prevention side of crime fighting, the proactive side, to fund more prisons and police, the reactive side. Of the \$5 billion previously allocated to prevention, this bill shifts \$2.5 billion to build more prisons according to a formula established by legislation passed by the House last week. Unfortunately, few states meet the requirements to receive funding and some estimate that states will have to spend \$60 billion on prison construction so that they can incarcerate prisoners long enough to qualify for assistance down the road. For my colleagues who are concerned about unfunded mandates, alarm bells should be going off.

The remaining \$2.5 billion will go into a new program relating to police officers. Unfortunately for the American people, this new program takes several steps backwards. First, it does not require that new officers to be engaged in community policing and may not result in 100,000 new police being put on the street. People want officers out of their cars and the station house and onto the streets of their neighborhoods. Communities which utilize community policing have seen their crime rates go down and relations between the police and residents dramatically improve. The Crime Bill encouraged this effective policy nationwide.

Virtually every major police organization in the country is opposed to altering the provisions of the Crime Bill relating to cops on the beat. The National Association of Police Organizations, the Law Enforcement Steering Committee, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs Association and the Police Executive Research Forum all strongly support the current program. Many of these groups are concerned that the provisions of H.R. 728 will not put 100,000 new police on our streets. I fail to see why the House would want to pass a bill which our law enforcement professionals say will undermine our efforts to put additional cops on the street. This is just another example of the unintended consequences of certain Republican policies which are not being provided careful scrutiny in committee.

I am also troubled by the fact this legislation eliminates the requirement that local communities pay part of the costs of hiring additional officers or buying new equipment. Law enforcement is a local function. Virtually no one in this chamber would argue that the Federal Government should begin paying for local police. Assistance in the Crime Bill is designed

to provide a rapid infusion of new officers to meet the challenges of violent crime. The Federal Government agreed to pay the vast majority of the costs, but asked local communities to make an investment as well. It only makes sense to ask communities to make a commitment to the safety of their residents. With a voluntary program, it makes even more sense to ask participants to pay part of the cost.

The need for a local contribution is more acute in light of efforts to pass a balanced budget amendment. I would like my Republican colleagues to explain how they plan to balance the budget by developing voluntary programs designed to meet profoundly local needs that don't require the local entity to put up any money? I know it is politically expedient to eliminate the local contribution. However, from a public policy and a budgetary standpoint, the things that should matter the most around here, this makes no sense. The Crime Bill struck a balance in this area, a balance which this bill destroys.

Finally, by eliminating support for prevention, I believe this bill will actually undermine efforts to substantially reduce crime in this country and drive up the costs of law enforcement. During debate on the Crime Bill last year, we all heard from communities across the Nation which have experienced substantial reductions in criminal activity when they set up after school programs, anti-gang initiatives, or provided job training to young people. Crime went down because kids had constructive things to do with their time and they were being given opportunities to do better in school or to learn a new skill that will help them get a good job down the road. Communities plagued by gang violence worked to combat it with programs to educate youngsters about the negative side of gangs and the list goes on and on. The bottomline is that communities are getting real results with prevention programs, results they aren't getting by sending more people to prison.

Prevention makes sense for several reasons. First, it is proactive, it works to reduce crime before it ever occurs, before the police have to be called and before someone goes to prison. The most effective way to make our communities safe is to stop crime in the first place. Second, prevention is probably the most cost-effective way to reduce crime. A community can invest \$25,000 in an anti-gang initiative which can serve countless young people. On the other hand, it costs about the same amount to incarcerate a single violent criminal for one year. We get a much greater return on the first \$25,000 than we do on the second. For people who want the Government to spend the American taxpayers' money wisely, nothing makes more sense than investing in prevention.

Mr. Chairman, this bill takes a giant step back in the fight against crime. It does not guarantee that 100,000 new police will be put on the streets, it does not stress community policing, and it repeals what I believe are the most cost-effective crime fighting programs. Major law enforcement organizations and our Nation's mayors and other elected officials have strong concerns about this bill. Moreover, it puts political expedience before good public policy by funneling billions to localities without requiring them to make an investment as well. I urge my colleagues to defeat this measure and preserve the existing cops on

the beat program as well as badly needed prevention initiatives.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 728. During the last session, the Democratic-led Congress passed a crime bill riddled with problems and weaknesses. Most notably, it would have spent billions of dollars on questionable social spending disguised as crime prevention.

The crime bill also placed so many conditions on local governments to receive Federal funds to hire more police that many could not even afford to apply for these funds.

To make matters worse, it assumed that all police departments needed or wanted to hire more police, ignoring the reality that many strongly felt that they could use the money in more effective and efficient ways—such as modernizing outdated equipment and hiring civilian office workers to move desk cops out on the streets.

Last year, I tried to offer an amendment to give local law enforcement flexibility to use these grants for these other important purposes—only to be rejected by the Rules Committee.

H.R. 728 addresses both problems. It authorizes \$10 billion of block grants over 5 years for law enforcement, replacing the police and crime prevention sections of the crime bill.

These grants can be used, among other things, to hire new officers, purchase equipment and technology directly related to law enforcement, pay overtime to current officers, enhance school security and establish citizen neighborhood watch programs. In other words, the \$4 billion in mandated social spending in the crime bill are gone and police departments now have the flexibility to spend Federal funds as they see fit.

After all, they are the ones on the front lines in the war on crime and certainly know better than Washington bureaucrats how to more effectively combat our crime problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am also very pleased that H.R. 728 preserves the Violence Against Women Act provisions in last year's crime bill.

This section created Federal penalties for interstate stalking or domestic abuse, strengthened existing Federal penalties for repeat sexual offenders and required restitution to victims in Federal sex offense cases. In addition, it created a civil rights violation for violent crimes motivated by gender, allowing victims of such crimes to sue for damages or court-ordered injunctions.

The act also authorized \$1.6 billion over 6 years for programs to fight violence against women.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 728—in combination with the other crime bills passed by the House during the past week—is a vast improvement on last year's crime bill and I urge my colleagues' support of this legislation.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we all recall last year's unfounded cries by the GOP that the 1994 crime bill was loaded with pork. Well, I've got news for you and the American people watching this debate today. H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act, is the true oinker. This thing squeals so loud, you'd think we were considering a farm bill instead of a crime bill.

Last year, the body made a commitment to the American people that we would tackle their concerns about crime with a targeted, smart, understanding approach and we did just that. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have decided to ditch this approach in

the name of political expediency and, ironically, have left a pigsty in their wake.

H.R. 728 is an absolute boondoggle. This legislation promises a whole heck of a lot, but guarantees absolutely nothing but the potential for abuse: \$10 billion of taxpayer funds will be shuttled to States and localities for the broad, general purpose of reducing crime and improving public safety with no specific goals up front and no indications that these funds will be spent responsibly.

Like the old Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grants that were plagued by mismanagement and fraud and finally terminated during the Reagan administration, grants under H.R. 728 could potentially go toward the purchase of so-called police patrol cars employed by high-ranking local officials for personal use, to support patronage jobs in law enforcement agencies, or to fund crime consultants whose only aim is to bilk the government.

My constituents strongly supported the addition of 100,000 officers to walk the streets, interacting in a positive way with average citizens and community leaders, strengthening the ties between law enforcement and localities, creating a safer environment in which our children can grow. Residents of several neighborhoods in my district in Chicago, such as North Lawndale and Austin, have been successful for some time now in organizing citizen partnerships with local authorities to tackle problems as they arise and ensure the continued vitality of the areas in which they work and live. In addition, suburbs in my district such as Maywood and Bellwood, IL, have worked diligently to create viable community policing programs and are in the process of starting these programs with the help of the 1994 crime bill.

H.R. 728 severely jeopardizes this progress. In fact, under this bill, there are no assurances that a single police officer will be hired.

Even more distressing is the fact that most all prevention moneys from last year's comprehensive crime legislation are gone, including the \$1.6 billion in long-awaited funds for the Local Partnership Act to grant cities the resources necessary to implement proven, cost-effective and much-needed health and educational crime prevention programs. Gone with that act is the 10-percent Federal set-aside I was able to include which would have provided localities across the Nation with the incentive to partner with small minority or women-owned businesses. I guess the GOP would rather build walls around some of the most disadvantaged areas of our cities and towns than provide relief and the hope of a successful future to hundreds of small enterprises and the neighborhoods in which they are located.

Also gone are the following: \$810 million in grants for a variety of after-school and summer programs for at-risk youth involving education, tutoring, and job preparation; \$626 million for up to 15 model programs intended to expand community services and new prevention strategies in high-crime, low-income areas; \$270 million for local community development corporations to implement vital economic revitalization projects such as those being undertaken on the West Side of Chicago, in my district, with the help of organizations like Bethel New Life, Inc.; and \$45 million in BATF gang prevention and education initiatives.

So as you can clearly see, we have before us a bill that substitutes uncertainty and irresponsibility for clarity and accountability. The American people have hardly called for such an extreme reversal.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues have rejected the common sense notion that giving individuals and families a greater stake in their communities, as we did in last year's crime legislation, is the best way to attack and deter lawlessness. They have rejected the belief that we need to provide hope and opportunity where there is little or none. They have rejected the fact that the threat of punishment and retribution neither prevents nor stops crime from occurring on its own. I strongly suggest we reject their irrational attempt to gut the 1994 crime bill. Vote "no" on H.R. 728.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MOLINARI) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUNDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, had come to no resolution thereon.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I ask special leave that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

Government Reform and Oversight; the Judiciary; Science; Small Business; and Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

Mr. SKAGGS. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just wanted to make sure that all of this had been cleared. We have determined with our leadership that it has.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 79 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 728.

□ 1635

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, with Mr. GUNDERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as having been read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 728

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I—LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS

"SEC. 101. PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

"(a) PAYMENT AND USE.—

"(1) PAYMENT.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, shall pay to each unit of local government which qualifies for a payment under this title an amount equal to the sum of any amounts allocated to such unit under this title for each payment period. The Director shall pay such amount from amounts appropriated to carry out this title.

"(2) USE.—Amounts paid to a unit of local government under this section shall be used by the unit for reducing crime and improving public safety, including but not limited to, 1 or more of the following purposes:

"(A)(i) Hiring, training, and employing on a continuing basis new, additional law enforcement officers and necessary support personnel.

"(ii) Paying overtime to presently employed law enforcement officers and necessary support personnel for the purpose of increasing the number of hours worked by such personnel.

"(iii) Procuring equipment, technology, and other material directly related to basic law enforcement functions.

"(B) Enhancing school security measures by—

"(i) providing increased law enforcement patrols in and around schools, whether through the hiring of additional law enforcement officers or paying overtime to presently employed officers;

"(ii) purchasing law enforcement equipment necessary to carry out normal law enforcement functions in and around schools;

"(iii) equipping schools with metal detectors, fences, closed circuit cameras, and other physical safety measures;

"(iv) gun hotlines designed to facilitate the reporting of weapons possession by students and other individuals in and around schools; and

"(v) preventing and suppressing violent youth gang activity.

"(C) Establishing crime prevention programs that may, though not exclusively, involve law enforcement officials and that are intended to discourage, disrupt, or interfere with the commission of criminal activity, including neighborhood watch and citizen patrol programs, sexual assault and domestic violence programs, and programs intended to prevent juvenile crime.

"(D) Establishing or supporting drug courts.

"(E) Establishing early intervention and prevention programs for juveniles to reduce or eliminate crime.

"(F) Enhancing the adjudication process of cases involving violent offenders, including the adjudication process of cases involving violent juvenile offenders.

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'violent offender' means a person charged with committing a part I violent crime; and

"(B) the term 'drug courts' means a program that involves—

"(i) continuing judicial supervision over offenders with substance abuse problems who are not violent offenders; and

"(ii) the integrated administration of other sanctions and services, which shall include—

"(I) mandatory periodic testing for the use of controlled substances or other addictive substances during any period of supervised release or probation for each participant;

"(II) substance abuse treatment for each participant;

"(III) probation, or other supervised release involving the possibility of prosecution, confinement, or incarceration based on noncompliance with program requirements or failure to show satisfactory progress; and

"(IV) programmatic, offender management, and aftercare services such as relapse prevention, vocational job training, job placement, and housing placement.

"(b) PROHIBITED USES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a unit of local government may not expend any of the funds provided under this title to purchase, lease, rent, or otherwise acquire—

"(1) tanks or armored personnel carriers;

"(2) fixed wing aircraft;

"(3) limousines;

"(4) real estate; or

"(5) yachts;

unless the Attorney General certifies that extraordinary and exigent circumstances exist that make the use of funds for such purposes essential to the maintenance of public safety and good order in such unit of local government.

"(c) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The Director shall pay each unit of local government that has submitted an application under this title not later than—

"(1) 90 days after the date that the amount is available, or

"(2) the first day of the payment period if the unit of local government has provided the Director with the assurances required by section 103(d),

whichever is later.

"(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director shall adjust a payment under this title to a unit of local government to the extent that a prior payment to the unit of local government was more or less than the amount required to be paid.

"(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Director may increase or decrease under this subsection a payment to a unit of local government only if the Director determines the need for the increase or decrease, or if the unit requests the increase or decrease, not later than 1 year after the end of the payment period for which a payment was made.

"(e) RESERVATION FOR ADJUSTMENT.—The Director may reserve a percentage of not more than 2 percent of the amount under this section for a payment period for all units of local government in a State if the Director considers the reserve is necessary to ensure the availability of sufficient amounts to pay adjustments after the final allocation of amounts among the units of local government in the State.

"(f) REPAYMENT OF UNEXPENDED AMOUNTS.—

"(1) REPAYMENT REQUIRED.—A unit of local government shall repay to the Director, by not later than 27 months after receipt of funds from the Director, any amount that is—

"(A) paid to the unit from amounts appropriated under the authority of this section; and

"(B) not expended by the unit within 2 years after receipt of such funds from the Director.

"(2) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REPAY.—If the amount required to be repaid is not repaid, the Director shall reduce payment in future payment periods accordingly.

"(3) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS REPAYED.—Amounts received by the Director as repayments under this subsection shall be deposited in a designated fund for future payments to units of local government.

"(g) NONSUPPLANTING REQUIREMENT.—Funds made available under this title to units of local government shall not be used to supplant State or local funds, but shall be used to increase the amount of funds that would, in the absence of funds made available under this title, be made available from State or local sources.

"SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

"(1) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1996;

"(2) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1997;

"(3) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

"(4) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

"(5) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

"(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 2.5 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 2000 shall be available to the Director for administrative costs to carry out the purposes of this title. Such sums are to remain available until expended.

"(c) AVAILABILITY.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

"SEC. 103. QUALIFICATION FOR PAYMENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall issue regulations establishing procedures under which a unit of local government is required to provide notice to the Director regarding the proposed use of funds made available under this title.

"(b) PROGRAM REVIEW.—The Director shall establish a process for the ongoing evaluation of projects developed with funds made available under this title.

"(c) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION.—A unit of local government qualifies for a payment under this title for a payment period only if the unit of local government submits an application to the Director and establishes, to the satisfaction of the Director, that—

"(1) the unit of local government has established a local advisory board that—

"(A) includes, but is not limited to, a representative from—

"(i) the local police department or local sheriff's department;

"(ii) the local prosecutor's office;

"(iii) the local court system;

"(iv) the local public school system; and

"(v) a local nonprofit, educational, religious, or community group active in crime prevention or drug use prevention or treatment;

"(B) has reviewed the application; and

"(C) is designated to make nonbinding recommendations to the unit of local government for the use of funds received under this title;

"(2) the chief executive officer of the State has had not less than 45 days to review and comment on the application prior to submission to the Director;

"(3) the unit of local government will establish a trust fund in which the government will deposit all payments received under this title;

"(4) the unit of local government will use amounts in the trust fund (including interest) during a period not to exceed 2 years from the date the first grant payment is made to the unit of local government;

"(5) the unit of local government will expend the payments received in accordance with the laws and procedures that are applicable to the expenditure of revenues of the unit of local government;

"(6) the unit of local government will use accounting, audit, and fiscal procedures that conform to guidelines which shall be prescribed by the Director after consultation with the Comptroller General and as applicable, amounts received under this title shall be audited in compliance with the Single Audit Act of 1984;

"(7) after reasonable notice from the Director or the Comptroller General to the unit of local government, the unit of local government will make available to the Director and the Comptroller General, with the right to inspect, records that the Director reasonably requires to review compliance with this title or that the Comptroller General reasonably requires to review compliance and operation;

"(8) a designated official of the unit of local government shall make reports the Director reasonably requires, in addition to the annual reports required under this title; and

"(9) the unit of local government will spend the funds made available under this title only for the purposes set forth in section 101(a)(2).

"(d) **SANCTIONS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Director determines that a unit of local government has not complied substantially with the requirements or regulations prescribed under subsections (a) and (c), the Director shall notify the unit of local government that if the unit of local government does not take corrective action within 60 days of such notice, the Director will withhold additional payments to the unit of local government for the current and future payment periods until the Director is satisfied that the unit of local government—

"(A) has taken the appropriate corrective action; and

"(B) will comply with the requirements and regulations prescribed under subsections (a) and (c).

"(2) **NOTICE.**—Before giving notice under paragraph (1), the Director shall give the chief executive officer of the unit of local government reasonable notice and an opportunity for comment.

"SEC. 104. ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.

"(a) **STATE SET-ASIDE.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the total amounts appropriated for this title for each payment period, the Director shall allocate for units of local government in each State an amount that bears the same ratio to such total as the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by such State to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available, bears to the number of part 1 violent crimes reported by all States to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for such years.

"(2) **MINIMUM REQUIREMENT.**—Each State shall receive not less than .25 percent of the total amounts appropriated under section 102 under this subsection for each payment period.

"(3) **PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION.**—If amounts available to carry out paragraph (2) for any payment period are insufficient to pay in full the total payment that any State is otherwise eligible to receive under paragraph (1) for such period, then the Director shall reduce payments under paragraph (1) for such payment period to the extent of such insufficiency. Reductions

under the preceding sentence shall be allocated among the States (other than States whose payment is determined under paragraph (2)) in the same proportions as amounts would be allocated under paragraph (1) without regard to paragraph (2).

"(b) **LOCAL DISTRIBUTION.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From the amount reserved for each State under subsection (a), the Director shall allocate—

"(A) among reporting units of local government the reporting units' share of such reserved amount; and

"(B) among nonreporting units of local government the nonreporting units' share of the reserved amount.

"(2) **AMOUNTS.**—

"(A) The reporting units' share of the reserved amount is the amount equal to the product of such reserved amount multiplied by the percentage which the population living in reporting units of local government in the State bears to the population of all units of local government in the State.

"(B) The nonreporting units' share of the reserved amount is the reserved amount reduced by the reporting units' share of the reserved amount.

"(3) **ALLOCATION TO EACH REPORTING UNIT.**—From the reporting units' share of the reserved amount for each State under subsection (a), the Director shall allocate to each reporting unit of local government an amount which bears the same ratio to such share as the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by such unit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available bears to the number of part 1 violent crimes reported by all units of local government in the State in which the unit is located to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for such years.

"(4) **ALLOCATION TO EACH NONREPORTING UNIT.**—From the nonreporting units' share of the reserved amount for each State under subsection (a), the Director shall allocate to each nonreporting unit of local government an amount which bears the same ratio to such share as the average number of part 1 violent crimes of like governmental units in the same population class as such unit bears to the average annual imputed number of part 1 violent crimes of all nonreporting units in the State for the 3 most recent calendar years.

"(5) **LIMITATION ON ALLOCATIONS.**—A unit of local government shall not receive an allocation which exceeds 100 percent of such unit's expenditures on law enforcement services as reported by the Bureau of the Census for the most recent fiscal year. Any amount in excess of 100 percent of such unit's expenditures on law enforcement services shall be distributed proportionally among units of local government whose allocation does not exceed 100 percent of expenditures on law enforcement services.

"(6) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) The term 'reporting unit of local government' means any unit of local government that reported part 1 violent crimes to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available.

"(B) The term 'nonreporting unit of local government' means any unit of local government which is not a reporting unit of local government.

"(C)(i) The term 'like governmental units' means any like unit of local government as defined by the Secretary of Commerce for general statistical purposes, and means—

"(I) all counties are treated as like governmental units;

"(II) all cities are treated as like governmental units;

"(III) all townships are treated as like governmental units.

"(ii) Similar rules shall apply to other types of governmental units.

"(D) The term 'same population class' means a like unit within the same population category

as another like unit with the categories determined as follows:

"(i) 0 through 9,999.

"(ii) 10,000 through 49,999.

"(iii) 50,000 through 149,999.

"(iv) 150,000 through 299,999.

"(v) 300,000 or more.

"(7) **LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH ALLOCATIONS OF LESS THAN \$10,000.**—If under paragraph (3) or (4) a unit of local government is allotted less than \$10,000 for the payment period, the amount allotted shall be transferred to the chief executive officer of the State who shall distribute such funds among units of local government whose allotment is less than such amount in a manner which reduces crime and improves public safety.

"(8) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

"(A) If a unit of local government in a State that has been incorporated since the date of the collection of the data used by the Director in making allocations pursuant to this section, such unit shall be treated as a nonreporting unit of local government for purposes of this subsection.

"(B) If a unit of local government in the State has been annexed since the date of the collection of the data used by the Director in making allocations pursuant to this section, the Director shall pay the amount that would have been allocated to such unit of local government to the unit of local government that annexed it.

"(c) **UNAVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—For purposes of this section, if data regarding part 1 violent crimes in any State for the 3 most recent calendar years is unavailable or substantially inaccurate, the Director shall utilize the best available comparable data regarding the number of violent crimes for such years for such State for the purposes of allocation of any funds under this title.

"SEC. 105. UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR.

"Funds or a portion of funds allocated under this title may be utilized to contract with private, nonprofit entities or community-based organizations to carry out the purposes specified under section 101(a)(2).

"SEC. 106. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A unit of local government expending payments under this title shall hold not less than 1 public hearing on the proposed use of the payment from the Director in relation to its entire budget.

"(b) **VIEWS.**—At the hearing, persons shall be given an opportunity to provide written and oral views to the unit of local government authority responsible for enacting the budget and to ask questions about the entire budget and the relation of the payment from the Director to the entire budget.

"(c) **TIME AND PLACE.**—The unit of local government shall hold the hearing at a time and place that allows and encourages public attendance and participation.

"SEC. 107. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

"The administrative provisions of part H of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, shall apply to this title and for purposes of this section any reference in such provisions to title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 shall be deemed to be a reference to this title.

"SEC. 108. DEFINITIONS.

"For the purposes of this title:

"(1) The term 'unit of local government' means—

"(A) a county, township, city, or political subdivision of a county, township, or city, that is a unit of local government as determined by the Secretary of Commerce for general statistical purposes; and

"(B) the District of Columbia and the recognized governing body of an Indian tribe or Alaskan Native village that carries out substantial governmental duties and powers.

“(2) The term ‘payment period’ means each 1-year period beginning on October 1 of any year in which a grant under this title is awarded.

“(3) The term ‘State’ means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands, except that American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands shall be considered as 1 State and that, for purposes of section 104(a), 33 percent of the amounts allocated shall be allocated to American Samoa, 50 percent to Guam, and 17 percent to the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(4) The term ‘juvenile’ means an individual who is 17 years of age or younger.

“(5) The term ‘part 1 violent crimes’ means murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault as reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for purposes of the Uniform Crime Reports.

“(6) The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Part Q of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is repealed effective on September 30, 1995.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), any funds that remain available to an applicant under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 shall be used in accordance with such part as in effect on the day preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, section 1001(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act is amended—

- (A) in paragraph (3), by striking “Q.”; and
(B) by striking paragraph (11).

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) OUNCE OF PREVENTION COUNCIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(2) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), any funds that remain available to an applicant under subtitle A of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 shall be used in accordance with such subtitle as in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) LOCAL CRIME PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.—Subtitle B of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(c) MODEL INTENSIVE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS.—Subtitle C of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(d) FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENDEAVOR SCHOOLS GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(2) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), any funds that remain available to an applicant under subtitle D of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 shall be used in accordance with such subtitle as in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) ASSISTANCE FOR DELINQUENT AND AT-RISK YOUTH.—Subtitle G of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(f) POLICE RETIREMENT.—Subtitle H of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(g) LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT.—

(1) SUBTITLE J.—Subtitle J of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(2) FEDERAL PAYMENTS.—Chapter 67 of title 31, United States Code is repealed.

(3) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle V of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the matter relating to chapter 67.

(4) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2), any funds that remain available to an applicant under chapter 67 of title 31, United States Code, shall be used in accordance with such chapter as in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(h) NATIONAL COMMUNITY ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP.—Subtitle K of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(i) URBAN RECREATION AND AT-RISK YOUTH.—
(1) RECREATION.—Subtitle O of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(2) URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY.—
(A) Section 1004 of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 is amended—

- (i) by striking subsection (d); and
(ii) by redesignating subsections (e) through (k) as (d) through (j), respectively.

(B) Section 1005 of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 is amended by inserting “and” at the end of paragraph (6), by striking “; and” and inserting a period at the end of paragraph (7), and by striking paragraph (8).

(C) Section 1007(b) of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 is amended by striking the last 2 sentences.

(D) Section 1013 of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 is amended by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” after “1013” and by striking subsection (b).

(j) COMMUNITY-BASED JUSTICE GRANTS FOR PROSECUTORS.—Subtitle Q of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(k) FAMILY UNITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Subtitle S of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(l) GANG RESISTANCE AND EDUCATION TRAINING.—(1) Subtitle X of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), any funds that remain available to an applicant under subtitle X of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 shall be used in accordance with such subtitle as in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(m) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The matter relating to title I in the table of contents of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE I—LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS

“Sec. 101. Payments to local governments.

“Sec. 102. Authorization of appropriations.

“Sec. 103. Qualification for payment.

“Sec. 104. Allocation and distribution of funds.

“Sec. 105. Utilization of private sector.

“Sec. 106. Public participation.

“Sec. 107. Administrative provisions.

“Sec. 108. Definitions.”.

(2) The table of contents of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended by striking the matter relating to subtitles A, B, C, D, G, H, J, K, O, Q, S, and X of title III.

(3) The table of contents of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by striking the matter relating to part Q of title I.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period not to exceed 10 hours.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read. Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHIFF: Strike subparagraph (B) of section 101(a)(2) of the Violent Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1994, as amended by section 2 of this bill, and insert the following:

“(B) Enhancing security measures—

“(i) in and around schools; and

“(ii) in and around any other facility or location which is considered by the unit of local government to have a special risk for incidents of crime.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, we take an approach in this bill that quite obviously one can see from the general debate not everyone is in accord with, and I strongly suspect that those Members who do not want our approach will vote no, virtually regardless of what amendments are and are not accepted here today.

Nevertheless, in accordance with our approach, I want to explain my amendment. Our amendment, as has been stated a number of times, is a block grant program to units of local government in which they can decide the best use of their funds. That may in fact be for more police. It may be for what we have come to call prevention programs. It may be for some combination of each. Our bill would leave that to the discretion of local government.

Nevertheless, we do in H.R. 728 provide several illustrations at least of what Congress has in mind for local governments to look at. These are not mandatory and they are not restrictive, just because we list several areas, such as hiring of police, is not totally restrictive on how local government should in fact use the funds. But it shows at least what Congress is considering. We then at that point defer to their discretion as local government officials elected essentially by the same constituencies that we have and that sent us here.

More particularly, Mr. Chairman, the bill states that the funds can be used, by way of illustration again, for the purpose of enhancing security, and the bill mentions as an illustration enhancing security of schools.

What I would do in this amendment is to keep the illustration of enhancing security at schools. I doubt that there is any State, probably no local government that does not have some problem in security somewhere in its schools. However, I would add in addition to that, and again we are illustrating here, units of local government can already use these funds to enhance security, they can already use it to enhance security at schools and anywhere else, but just to make that fact clear, to make clear that schools are not all-encompassing and that nothing is left out, I would add the words that the local governments could use the funds

to enhance security at schools and in and around any other facility or location which is considered by the unit of local government to have a special risk for incidents of crime.

We had a debate in the Committee on the Judiciary about the fact that some communities have a special incidence of crime at reproductive clinics.

□ 1640

I want to say that I helped cosponsor and helped pass the Federal law we passed which made it a crime to use violence and otherwise illegally interfere with people's access to reproductive clinics.

That is indeed one problem that is faced in certain communities, but not all communities. In Albuquerque, NM, which I have the privilege of representing, in the last Christmas season holidays the Albuquerque police department put a substation in the parking lot of the largest shopping center. As we might expect, crime went down in that shopping center dramatically. It had been rather high up until then with attacks, shoplifting, break-ins and so forth. The subject is without limit.

There could be any number of special areas, locations, facilities that a unit of the local government feels needs enhanced security and my amendment would illustrate this could be used by the local government in any such place whether it is a reproductive clinic, a mall, a school, a neighborhood, any other place that the unit of local government feels has a special risk of being subject to crime.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New Mexico would just stay a minute I would like to ask him a couple of questions about his amendment, if I may. As I read the bill, and correct me if I am wrong, the only limitations actually on any unit of local government is on line 21, page 2 of the bill where it says for reducing crime and improving public safety. Is there any other limitation?

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there are any other limitations as set out in the bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. After that it says including but not limited to. Included but not limited to is everything on page 3 where the gentleman is amending, is that correct?

Mr. SCHIFF. The gentleman is again correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yours is a limitation of the language on page 3; it is not a limiting amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. If the gentleman will yield further, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding, all of the examples given in the bill as drafted are illustrations. The operative language, as the gentleman from Missouri pointed out a little bit earlier, is that the grants can

be used for these ideas but not limited to these ideas.

I am merely in my amendment expanding the illustrations that we gave in terms of enhancing security, because it was suggested in the Committee on the Judiciary that a local government could not use such funds to enhance security at areas other than schools and particularly at reproductive clinics, and my amendment is intended simply to make clear by way of illustration that wherever a unit of government has a need for enhanced security they can provide it. I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. VOLKMER. What the gentleman is saying to me and making clear is under the bill as it is written, if a unit of the local government feels it is necessary to have policemen around abortion clinics they can have all of the police around the abortion clinics that the Federal Government will fund them under this.

Mr. SCHIFF. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is exactly correct. They can use police to enhance security wherever they feel there is a special need to enhance security. My amendment is not absolutely authorization, it is an illustration.

Mr. VOLKMER. If they feel and the Attorney General would feel it is for reducing crime and improving public safety, that is the limitation. It does not make any difference what the gentleman's amendment says.

Mr. SCHIFF. Basically the gentleman is correct in that my amendment is an illustration and the local governments are free to make this choice. There were some who felt that was not clear enough, which is the reason for my amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman's amendment is to make it clear we can use moneys from these funds to have people that are picketing at abortion clinics go to jail.

Mr. SCHIFF. It could be used to help local law enforcement identify wherever they felt that a special incidence of crime, that is up to them to decide in their communities.

Mr. VOLKMER. Reclaiming my time, what the gentleman is telling me, this bill is really going to restrict pro-life people from picketing abortion clinics, and I am glad to hear about that.

One other thing that I noticed in here is that I remember I did not vote for that crime bill last time, I think the gentleman might remember that. I thought it was pretty lousy. In fact, I put a bill in this morning to repeal the whole thing and start brand new, because I think yours is lousy too and you do not do much better.

We had a big discussion on the same floor of the same House last August, ranting and raving about midnight basketball. I find midnight basketball and I find morning and afternoon and evening basketball in here. You want basketball, you name it, you can have it any time you want it. It is not even limited to midnight. Any kind of bas-

ketball, as long as local units of government feel it is necessary to reduce crime and improve public safety. That is what I find in this, and I find a lot of other things.

It is very interesting, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] because earlier on during debate I was over in my office and doing some work around the office, and I listened to him and how he believes so strongly in local government and how great local government is; and local government, I agree, sometimes it is and sometimes it is not.

Mr. HYDE. Just like Washington.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am going to yield in a minute.

I remember the gentleman was here and I was here when we found out all of these things about LEAA and we were not happy. Then I find in this bill the local government may not be quite, may not just be quite the local government that the gentleman told us because right in here in the bill it says we do not want them buying tanks or armored personnel carriers, fixed-wing aircraft, limousines, real estate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOLKMER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I find that and that tells me the gentleman does not trust local government, because surely his local government the way he described it in general debate would never do this.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I hope the gentleman knows I supported LEAA. I voted for it. I had some concerns and they were good concerns because the LEAA was mismanaged. We correct that in our bill, but I supported LEAA. Did the gentleman know that? I do not think he did or he would not have brought it up.

Mr. VOLKMER. I do not think I would have supported something that even President Reagan, this House, and our Senate at that time found there was such gross abuses in by local units of government, using it for things it should not have been used for.

Mr. HYDE. We correct that here. We have ways of correcting that. We learned from LEAA, and we are building on that experience.

But would the gentleman yield on the Schiff amendment?

Mr. VOLKMER. Sure. I am glad to yield on any amendment.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman knows how I feel about abortion and am very much opposed to killing unborn children. But I suggest to the gentleman that under the block grant concept wherever the public safety is at risk, and this is in the judgment of the local officials, they are permitted to employ policemen or security anywhere in

their community where they think the public safety is at risk.

Now this could be around abortion clinics, and I know the gentleman feels that is picking on the pro-life moment. I regret that. I do not want to pick on the pro-life movement, but if safety is jeopardized, then it seems to me the local community authorities have the right and ought to have the right to have policemen there protecting the public safety, and I do not see that as a violation of my commitment nor the gentleman's commitment to the pro-life cause.

Mr. VOLKMER. If I still have time remaining, I would just like to comment to the gentleman that a local unit of government, if it sees fit under this bill, can make a specific proposal to the Attorney General's office, to the Department of Justice, specifically asking for dollars to employ people in order to protect clinics because there are too many picketers around the clinics and proposals can come in for that specific purpose and be studied for that specific purpose under this bill the way it is written.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Only if in their judgment the public safety is endangered. Surely the gentleman does not want the public safety endangered by any group that is picketing.

Mr. VOLKMER. I do not want the public safety, but I think a lot of times the people that are out there picketing are not endangering anybody. We have had this discussion; I thought we were on the same side.

Mr. HYDE. We are on the same side. We are on the same side. But nobody has the right to violate and create a threat to public safety.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] again has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOLKMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I think I have tried to point out some of the things that are severely wrong with this bill, and I think it goes too broad, permits any and every thing that you can use your imagination for if you are a member of local government. And one thing it does not do, it does not let the chief of police in my local town make a decision about it. It lets all of the other people make that decision. It does not let my local sheriff decide, it lets other people make that decision.

It depends on who can persuade that unit of local government what they best need the money for. And if I remember, I doubt if there are very many communities to say that have all kinds of money laying around, and they do not need some money for a lot of things and they are the ones that are going to decide what their priorities are.

□ 1650

And if that priority is to have some more police or security at abortion clinics, then that is what they will make it for.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes legislative history is more interesting than other times. This particular amendment from my friend, and the gentleman from New Mexico, has such an interesting history that I feel compelled to share it with my colleagues, because I think it is a nice effort but ultimately an unsuccessful one, and I believe it will have to be improved upon tomorrow by our colleague from Colorado.

Let use even begin the education process now, because one of the major issues we now have before us is whether or not the constitutional right of women to get abortions, if they choose, will, in fact, be fully protected. That is under attack, it seems to me, with regard to the nomination of Dr. Foster, but there is also a collateral attack here in the House. What we have in this amendment is basically an effort to deflect our defense.

The bill came before us in the Committee on the Judiciary with the language that the gentleman from New Mexico has described, which says, under this bill, local governments can do pretty much what they think necessary for law enforcement. But that is not all it said. If that was all it said, I suppose that would have been the end of it. But it went on to give some illustrations. It went on to say in language of the legislation, including but not limited to, and it listed some things in the bill that the Republicans brought forward. Presumably these were favored programs, programs they wanted to highlight. They were not just wasting words. They were not legislatively binding on the local communities, but they felt it was important to highlight certain things, and then when we got to committee, two Republican members for the committee felt that even further highlighting was necessary.

The gentleman from New Mexico himself offered one regarding violence. I thought it was an excellent one. I thought it was a very good idea to highlight that these could be used for violence against women and domestic violence. The gentleman from North Carolina, a former police official, said well, wait a minute, some people think we are anti-drug courts; drug courts are a good idea, and I want to show that drug courts are possible under this. We thought both amendments were a good idea. We supported them. Then the gentlewoman from Colorado said,

Look, we have a serious problem in this country with deadly violence being used against people who are trying to provide abortion or other health services for women, and we want to highlight that.

By the exact same logic that said you highlight drug courts and you high-

light domestic violence and other things that were in the bill, we are afraid in some communities people will not understand that you can use these to protect clinics. This is a matter of great sensitivity to my district where two young women were killed in the town of Brookline only recently for doing nothing other than trying to provide these services. So the gentlewoman from Colorado, quite sensibly, said, "This is what we should do."

It seems to me from my distance some uncertainty from the other side of the aisle as to how they should respond. The gentlewoman from Colorado was simply following their lead and said, "This is important. Let us not have any confusion at the local level. Let us highlight it." She accepted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to her amendment. But the chairman of the committee said, "This is a bad idea." He did not want you to appear to be sanctioning in some way what goes on at these clinics. He opposed it. It became clear the gentlewoman from Colorado would bring it up on the floor.

So my friends on the other side have a bit of a dilemma, because they are not men and women who like violence. They are men and women conscientiously opposed to it. Some of them had a problem appearing too specifically to be defending the right of these reproductive clinics to get safety, so what has emerged but the amendment from the gentleman from New Mexico. It was not in the original Republican bill. It was not presented when the gentleman had other amendments in the committee. It is proposed to try to deflect the gentlewoman from Colorado. I think it is a perfectly harmless amendment and have no objection to it. People should understand our friend from Colorado is harder to deflect than they may have thought. I am surprised they do not realize that.

Many of us still believe, given the violence that has been very specifically directed at abortion providers on an interstate basis, given the controversial nature of that protection unfortunately in some communities, it is still important to make it clear to people beyond doubt that police overtime and other facilities can be used under this bill to protect reproductive clinics and, therefore, I welcome the gentleman from New Mexico, and I appreciate his desire to shield some of his colleagues from having to take a tough vote.

I have to say it does not seem to me to work. I think that having adopted this amendment, it will still be relevant to have the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for his recollection of the processes by which this amendment came to the floor. What this could be called is the big duck amendment, because

what we are going to try to do now is get around—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. CONYERS and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for additional minutes.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I further yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking minority member.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] was clearly planning to offer an amendment that would specify that funds may be used to protect reproductive health clinics which have been targeted for violence lately around the country. This amendment appears to be a round-about way of addressing that concern and a way for Republican Members to avoid a straight up-or-down vote on whether to provide special protection for our abortion clinics.

And it will not work, because it fails to specify that Congress recognizes the need to protect the reproductive health centers. That is what is in trouble now.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Let me say, reclaiming my time, we are talking not just about public buildings. We are talking about some facilities that might be private. In committee, the gentleman from Florida said, "Well, wait a minute, you do not want to give public funds to private facilities to buy equipment with." We said, "That is right." The gentlewoman accommodated that. It might be appropriate, however, to lend certain facilities to certain locations for certain time.

So this does not obviate the need to point it out. When you begin to look at the examples, if there is an example anywhere of violence in this country which is fairly widespread sadly, it is violence aimed at these clinics, and therefore, it is certainly, if they are going to single things out, something that ought to be singled out.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I hope the gentlewoman will continue to offer the same provision she offered in the committee, because we need to have it clearly discussed and debated on the floor.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I do think the gentlewoman from Colorado is to be congratulated, because she got us started early. I do think that absent the gentlewoman from Colorado our friend from New Mexico would not have been up with the first amendment, and I thank our friend from Colorado for getting into this so early. As I said, I understand the motivation. I understand the notion it would be nice to avoid the issue, but I think the question of safety for reproductive clinics is too important to be folded into a kind of parliamentary sidestep.

Therefore, while I will vote for this, I will also vote with the gentlewoman tomorrow.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his recollection and let me thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his amendment.

But there are some questions that I have about the gentleman's amendment that I would like some clarifications on. The amendment I was planning to offer would allow Congress, or would allow local authorities, to pay overtime for law enforcement officers in protecting women's reproductive health care clinics.

Do you feel your amendment is broad enough to include that, the overtime issue?

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. In my opinion, my amendment, well, once again, I just have to back up to say again, we are talking about illustrations here. I think the operative authorization language is already there, and I think that authorization language would allow the payment of overtime for police officers to provide security at reproductive clinics if the unit of local government thought that was necessary.

I would just add, at least as an illustration, we are pointing out to the unit of local government they can provide security many other places.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So then I kind of hear that as the answer is "no."

Let me say the one thing I worry about the gentleman's amendment not being inclusive enough also on is that the gentleman says in and around any facility or location considered by the unit of local government to have a special risk. Now, what I was trying to do in my amendment is say that lots of localities have been hesitant to enforce this right of women to have access to a health care clinic, and I think that that might be the big duck in which local communities could duck out from under this. They could say, "Well, we do not consider it dangerous," because that is really the qualifier on it.

What I would like to ask the gentleman from New Mexico is, if this would be possible, because I think he is trying hard, and I appreciate what he is trying to do. What if we were to offer an amendment to the gentleman's amendment, first, you would have (i), "in and around schools," which has no qualifiers in front of it.

□ 1700

What if you then had (ii), "in and around women's reproductive health clinics," again with no qualifiers, like schools, and then you could do other facilities that have qualifications. We could draft that and make that an amendment to the gentleman's amendment. I think that would be clearer on

point because the issue here being one of a constitutional right that we think has a much higher Federal level of calling than just random crime. I think that would then give this a little more status, and we would believe then it would be a little clearer to the communities that this is indeed what Congress intended by this amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just have to say, as an aside, and as a supporter of the law that passed in the last Congress making it a Federal offense to commit violence, to prevent people from entering reproductive clinics, not simply for picketing them, as was referred to by a previous speaker, perhaps is a matter for another hearing. The prosecutions with which I am familiar that the Federal Justice Department has brought under that act appear to me to be duplications of prosecutions brought under State law.

So the representations that the States are not enforcing the law, which is the representation I accepted when I supported that act, I would like examined perhaps at a hearing. I mention that because of the gentlewoman bringing up the subject.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If I may reclaim my time, I do not think we are communicating. What I am saying is clearly what I want to do is send a strong message from this Congress to local officials that with this money comes the ability for them to then have no excuses for protecting women's constitutional rights because we spoke before on that very clearly when we passed the prior bill.

Now, there may be some ancillary issues. I understand what the gentleman is saying. But I do not think that message gets through with the gentleman's amendment, because he has that qualifier on it. That is why I am saying could he accept a substitute that would specifically list women's reproductive health facilities? Because then I think it is standing there clearly, saying we will not accept excuses to localities who get money and then do not use it.

Mr. SCHIFF. If the gentlewoman would yield further, I made the point at the point the gentlewoman reclaimed her time, just in response to the lady's point that there are localities that are reluctant to protect reproductive clinics, that is the representation on which I voted to make it a Federal offense to use violence to interfere with entrance to reproductive clinics.

I am merely pointing out—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. SCHIFF and by unanimous consent, Mrs. SCHROEDER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield further to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say with respect to that issue that the gentlewoman has raised, I have not seen the Federal Justice Department prosecute cases primarily where local government or State government has not prosecuted. I have seen duplication of prosecution, the same individual prosecuted twice. I am again saying that that may be a matter of further inquiry.

Also I wanted to respond with respect to the gentlewoman's suggested amendment, I would oppose the additional amendment for this reason: As we discussed the matter in the Committee on the Judiciary, there was universal agreement, as I understand it, that in every State there are locations where schools have a security problem. There was no move by either side of the aisle to remove, as an illustration, enhancing security at schools. I feel past that point, that different localities have different threats to their security and different needs of law enforcement.

I think in a number of localities the gentlewoman's point is quite correct, there is a threat of violence at reproductive clinics. I do not think that has been shown to be all over the Nation.

I make it as clear as I can, in terms of Congress' intent, that my illustration even if it were operative, which it is not, would allow the communities to provide additional security support at reproductive clinics or anywhere else in their communities they felt it was needed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Reclaiming my time, I feel bad that we cannot get agreement to add it here as freestanding, because at that point I think we can prevent having an amendment later on.

The reason I feel that way is the gentleman from New Mexico and I seem to be agreeing that the reason we got into this in the clinic violence bill last year was that we were afraid localities were not doing their job in some places. Now, the gentleman feels like maybe there is duplication. I do not think that is the issue.

The issue is: Are we putting a qualifier on this so that localities can continue to refuse?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would also point out, Mr. Chairman, that many, many Americans would not have the benefit of having been on this floor when we had this debate. There would be uncertainty. There would be localities—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and by unanimous consent,

Mrs. SCHROEDER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentlewoman continue to yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I do yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman again for yielding.

The point is there will be differences about how to spend this money locally.

Local governments are not monolithic. Some people will say, "Well, they list this and they list that, they list schools, they do not list the clinics. It is disfavored. It is not one of the things that they wanted us to do."

We understand it is all optional locally, but if you did not think there was any point in listing things, you would not have listed things in your bill. You would not have added amendments listing things in committee.

We believe, to resolve any dispute because we know protecting reproductive clinics is an issue that is debated at local levels, whether you should or should not, unfortunately; therefore, since it is likely to be debatable, we think for you to have listed in your bill some issues and left this one out specifically by name would be a mistake. That is why, in addition to this, we think the gentlewoman's amendment would be necessary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentlewoman for continuing to yield.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], again we are dealing with illustrative language. I was sensitive to the argument made in the Committee on the Judiciary that even where you were proceeding with illustrations, there could, by omission, be an implication that something is not intended by Congress. The amendment I am offering is as all-encompassing as I can make it, that the local government can select any location or facility where they think they have a security need to enhance security with a block grant under this bill.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Reclaiming my time, that is precisely why I do not think the gentleman is getting where he wants to go without specifically listing health care clinics, because he does say, when it comes to any other facility, it is qualified "as the local community's saying it is needed." And that qualification, as far as I am concerned, is the qualification that kills it and does not send the clear, resonating message that we think Federal funds should go to protect Federal constitutional rights.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, if this did not separately say schools, there might be an argument. But it separately says schools and a lot of other things.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, we are going to revisit this debate when the gentlewoman offers her amendment. So we are in for a bit of a debate here.

Just in passing, I must say, if it were not so tragic, it would be amusing. The wordsmiths on the other side use euphemisms like reproductive rights when they are talking about abortion. Why do they not call it abortion? Let us be intellectually honest. Or is there something unpleasant about that word? There is nothing reproductive about killing an unborn child. The gentlewoman wants to elevate reproductive health clinics, anything but what she really means, which is abortion clinics, or abortion mills. She wants to elevate that to a very special place where the bill, the block grant program, will specify they get special protection.

Now, I am not against abortion clinics getting protection by the police if they reasonably expect violence or a threat to safety. I say that clearly.

The gentleman from Missouri may not agree with me, but threats to safety; it is the business of government to protect people from threats to safety. So I have no problem with that.

What I have a problem with is elevating abortion clinics to a special status over other places where an awful lot of killing really goes on.

In 1993 there were 1,946 people killed in New York. In the great District of Columbia there were 454 murders. In Chicago, my city, there were 845 murders. How many cab drivers have been murdered in their cabs?

We cannot specify every place, every location, every convenience store, every liquor store, every currency exchange that is going to be threatened by robbery and people with guns that are going to kill people. Communities where there are gangs that are armed; you cannot spell it all out, especially in the block grant program.

□ 1710

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts, when we start eroding the notion that this is within the call—it is the call of the local government, by suggesting drug courts and suggesting violence against women, we have ourselves eroded the concept of the block grant. I could not agree more; logic forces me to do that. However, because we did it two times does not mean we need to do it 20 times.

Now what we are doing here with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] is we are broadening the concept that wherever the public safety is threatened, and that includes abortion clinics, if

the gentlewoman does not blanch at the term—it includes that, but to specify them gives them a status that I am, frankly, unwilling to yield, and that is where I come down.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. It will be very brief because, as my colleague knows, I am just amazed about the support for this bill in general because of what it does do as far as abortion clinics, and as my colleague knows, we have people out there that are picketing, taking their time, their youth, their adults, their grandfathers, their grandmothers, and everything. They are trying to save unborn babies. That is where the crime is. I say to my colleague, "That's what's happening, and the way I read this bill, you're just going to help it happen."

Mr. HYDE. Does the gentleman say they are entitled to freedom of speech?

Mr. VOLKMER. I say they are entitled to freedom of speech and freedom to walk down there, and what I am afraid of is that in the name in some localities they will get these Federal funds, and they will put people down there so they cannot do that—

Mr. HYDE. I appreciate what the gentleman says, and indeed the gentleman and I are on the same side.

I just want to say the reason the gentlewoman's subsequent amendment is flawed is it continues to erode the notion of block grants, which is that the call for where these policemen should go and with what equipment shall be made by the unit of local government, not us here in Washington. It is that simple.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. May I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado and then to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. First of all, let me explain to the gentleman from Illinois why these are called reproductive health care centers.

Mr. HYDE. Please do.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is because most women of reproductive age get their entire health care through their reproductive years through these clinics.

Mr. HYDE. If they just performed abortion, the gentlewoman would not want them protected?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am not afraid to say the word "abortion." But I must tell the gentleman, if you look at most of these clinics—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] has expired.

(On request of Mrs. SCHROEDER and by unanimous consent, Mr. HYDE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I say to the gentleman, if you look at these clinics, you will find that it is a very, very

small percentage of what people are doing. Basically, they're going for family planning information, for mammograms, for breast checks, for Pap smears, for the whole range of services, and many even extend services to the children.

Mr. HYDE. And 1½ million abortions a year in this country.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But their problem is that what has happened is, as the gentleman knows, is that this is a constitutionally protected right, but localities have been under siege because of people going beyond just passive—no one has any problem with free speech, but they are going on with a very aggressive type approach to it, and that is why I feel, if we do not put clinics in there free standing, then it will not override communities who were refusing to protect them, and I think Federal money ought to go for federally constitutional rights. I think that is a very important—

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I think under the block grant concept it ought to be up to local government. If they want to send police there, they ought to send them, and, if they do not, they ought not, and we should not tell them how to deploy their policemen.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like it to be made clear that the debate going on now is whether the authority to send in protection should reside at the local level or not, and in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico it resides at the local level.

In the discussion with the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], she does not want it to reside, the decision of whether police are to be provided or not for these clinics—she wants it to be specifically in this legislation that reproductive health centers shall be protected. Why? Because that is the focus of where the violence is occurring.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right. What we do not want is localities to be able to use the resource scarce rule to protect women from a federally—from a Federal constitutional right, and if they are getting resources from the Federal Government, but then refusing to protect the Federal taxpayers, half of whom are women, and all of them pay exactly the same amount men do, I do not want them to be able to use some other criteria. So that is why I think it very important it be free standing rather than it be modified.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. As soon as I say this:

It has been made clear by the gentleman from Illinois that we are trying to duck whether there will be a direct

authority to protect these clinics in this crime bill or whether it will be left in some discretionary pool with a lot of other problems in which they may or may be included.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Illinois is one of the most intellectually honest people here, and he has just made clear why so many of us will be supporting the gentlewoman's amendment tomorrow. He is conscientiously, and firmly, and on principle opposed congresses legalized abortion, and he says he does not want abortion clinics or other reproductive clinics included in this bill by name because it would give them a status that he does not want them to have.

Yes, I want them to have the status. The status is as entities that are known as eligible for protection against murder and protection against criminals. Once we begin to list some things—there are two and a half pages of specific examples in the bill my Republican friends brought forward—if we list some things and do not list others, we put them—apparently the gentleman agrees—in a disfavored category.

There was not any controversy about a lot of what the police do in this country, but there has unfortunately been controversy about protecting Planned Parenthood and other clinics that provide these services, and at this point, having mentioned some of these things, if after the gentleman from Illinois has been honest enough to say he is opposed to mentioning abortion because he does not want to see them get that status, if tomorrow the gentlewoman's amendment is voted down, it will be correctly interpreted as one more step on the part of some people who want de facto to take away the legal protected status of abortion because they will have passed a bill in which some things have been mentioned, others will have not been mentioned, and my colleagues will have specifically repudiated, if my colleagues vote down that amendment, protection for abortion clinics.

There is some controversy, as I said, at the local level. What we are doing is saying this: "We want to send a clear signal to people at the local level, without any debate about it, that it is possible for you to use your Federal funds this way," and the only reason to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment that makes any sense is the one conscientiously articulated by the gentleman from Illinois. He is so strongly opposed to abortion that he does not want us to call attention to the fact that they have this status where they are eligible for protection. That, to me, is a reason to pass it.

Mr. CONYERS. And so, even if we accept, or if the Schiff amendment passes, it does not change the underlying problem that has been raised in

committee about protecting reproductive health clinics. We cannot get around it, my colleagues. We have got to face it. We are the Congress. This is where the issue is going to be decided, the rubber hits the road. There is no way we can collapse it into some general language that will include anything and everything and then leave it to the discretion of local officials to pick it up.

I say to my colleagues, "This is the big duck amendment. Whether you like it or don't, it doesn't change the problem that victims of the violence at health clinics need protection, and I urge that we keep this in mind as this debate moves on."

□ 1720

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, one that was not printed in the RECORD, the technology assistance amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER:

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Add (c) TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE.—(1) The Attorney General shall reserve 1% in FY 1996 through FY 1998 authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for use by the National Institute of Justice in assisting local units to identify, select, develop, modernize and purchase new technologies for use by law enforcement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I think this should go fairly simply. This is about the National Institute of Justice, which many of us feel with this amendment we are going to be able to avoid many of the pitfalls that we saw with LEAA. This is basically a new group that has really started that is kind of like what the firemen have had all along. It is a group that tests the different equipment, that can tell you what works and what does not work. When you have got over 17,000 police entities and their average number of cops per police entity is like 12, you know they do not have their own R&D department. When they go to purchase stuff, the only people they are getting objective information from is the vendor, and we all know that might be a little slanted. Caveat emptor rings loudly.

So this is a group that has really gotten a terrific track record in doing R&D and transferring military technology to law enforcement and trying to get a much better deal for the taxpayer every way around. What they have done with bulletproof vests, with fingerprinting, with all sorts of standards, I think is long overdue. The firemen had this ages ago.

So I think if the gentleman from Florida can accept this?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I think the gentlewoman from Colorado has worked up a fine amendment. What I understand it would do is it sets aside 1 percent per year for the National Institute of Justice for these purposes. That would amount to roughly \$20 million a year for the life of the bill.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There are three people. When 17,000 entities come knocking at the doors, they are going to need a little more help.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. If the gentlewoman would continue to yield, while the subcommittee has not had the opportunity to hold the kind of hearings we would like to on the National Institute of Justice programs which the gentlewoman has represented and several members on the committee, including Mr. SCHIFF, are aware of, we want to put this in the bill because it is the suitable place to go to set aside the money. But after the time has passed here and we get off the floor, we are going to hold some hearings in our subcommittee before this bill winds up going to conference with the Senate and see what all we can learn to help further enhance this.

For right now, I think this is a very appropriate provision, I would like to do this, and I accept the amendment in the spirit in which it is offered.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida, because he has been wonderful on this, as has the gentleman from New Mexico, a cosponsor, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER]. We have a real bipartisan agreement on this one. I really appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend the gentlewoman for drafting this amendment. We have discussed this at great length. We are pretty much in agreement, Mr. Chairman, that oftentimes modern law enforcement officers are Wyatt Earp in a car. Many of the attachments they have in terms of what they have available to them in the way of technology have not changed for many, many decades.

I am pleased to say it is starting to change around the country, from simply computer access within police automobiles, to research going into items such as smart guns, in this particular case a police officer having a weapon that cannot be fired unless he or she, that is that officer, is in fact holding that weapon. A large number of the police officers shot in the line of duty across the country are shot with their own weapons.

That technology goes even further than police officers. We could prevent

some of the tragedies that happen when children get hold of firearms if we could simply keep applying that technology. So advancement in this area is very necessary.

Although our side has not from the committee entertained very well the idea of reserving and earmarking funds for various purposes, and I strongly support the fact that we will oppose some amendments coming later in that regard, I think that this is very appropriate for this reason: Small police and small sheriff departments cannot be expected to have the resources to do all of the analysis necessary to know what technology is presently on the shelf and available to them, and how it works and the cost and so forth. Therefore, a centralized department, in this case the NIJ at the Department of Justice, has been selected for that purpose.

I have to say, as the gentleman from Florida indicated, there is at least some reservation as to whether the NIJ is the right agency to do this right now, and that is a matter that we may have to discuss if that amendment is accepted and the matter goes to conference with the other body.

I want to say wholeheartedly the concept offered in this amendment is a great improvement in the bill, and will greatly benefit law enforcement.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank both gentlemen for their support. It is one of the ways we will be spending the rest of the funds a lot smarter and will hopefully not repeat the LEAA problems we had before.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I think that this is an excellent job done by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF]. It is really essential that we take military technology and apply it so that we can have law enforcement and use it. And the amount of technology, when I was chairman of the subcommittee we explored this, is enormous. With a little bit of help, they can take that technology and convert it.

So I think this is an excellent, excellent amendment. I am delighted the other side will accept it. I know I have talked to the gentleman from Florida, and our subcommittee will have hearings and go further in terms of exploring. I have a particular interest, of course. I see my good friend from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] is in the Chamber. Rone Laboratories, in upstate New York, is helping out here, and they are very able to do that.

So overall this is a very, very good idea, and I hope that all Members accept it. The technology, Mr. Chairman, is unbelievable. The idea that a police officer might be able to just point a ray in a certain direction and see who has

an armed weapon on him, the ballistics tracing types of technology, the ways of finding all these things out are just enormous, and we ought to be using them.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York, because I did mention his leadership too. The gentleman had some wonderful hearings. I always figure if you can get a double bang for the people's buck, which is what you are doing with this, it is great. Not only that, but our military is going to need that too, because they are looking more like law enforcement officers every day. This has been a very exciting program, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this Schroeder amendment, and I am glad to hear the conversation ongoing here between the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], the author, the gentlewoman from Colorado, and my colleague from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Currently, H.R. 728 contains no money for research and development of law enforcement technologies, and this amendment would appropriate a mere fraction of the block grant authorizations for 3 years to focus on the development of technology assistance.

This is critical. Wyatt Earp would recognize much of today's police technology, and it has been a long time since Wyatt Earp was around. Law enforcement officers must be afforded the opportunity to take advantage of new technologies to take that proverbial bite out of crime and to prevent injury and alter the balance of powers criminals possess to control America's streets. I want the good guys to have all the technology they need on their side.

All over America we have outstanding research facilities. In my own congressional district, Rone Laboratories, one of the premier military laboratories anywhere in the world, with responsibility for command, control, communications, and computer technology, is working cooperatively with the National Institute of Justice to develop the type of technology that our law enforcement officials can effectively use to wage war on crime. It is an exciting concept. I applaud the initiative and effort of the gentlewoman from Colorado.

I once again thank my colleague from New Mexico, and the chair of the subcommittee, Mr. MCCOLLUM, for outstanding leadership in this area, and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. HYDE. We want the good guys to have what they need. All of us want to stop the bad guys, the guys we are after. With technology advancements that make them better able to do what

they want to do, and when our guys try to get in there, they do not have the equipment they need.

□ 1730

There are all sorts of possibilities. One could hold something the size of a pack of cigarettes in their hand and point it at a crowd and be able to detect a weapon instantly. They could detect illegal substances under special circumstances. There are all sorts of exciting developments taking place in the marketplace out there.

The other thing that really thrills me and should thrill all of us is the fact that we are getting such magnificent cooperation from our military laboratories. They are reaching out. They are making available their expertise to work in sensitive areas like this.

So I rise in the strongest possible support of this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to give it the attention it deserves and to take advantage of it, because it is good for America.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of this amendment. The continuing episodes of violence directed against women's reproductive health care clinics across the Nation and the providers and patients that work at and utilize such facilities are an outrage. We must put an end to these growing attacks once and for all.

Last year Congress passed legislation containing provisions making it a Federal crime for a person to physically restrict or bar access to a medical facility for the sole purpose of dissuading or stopping someone from receiving reproductive health services. In addition, this legislation contained provisions not only to allow women and clinics the ability to obtain injunctions against protestors employing blockades, but also to permit victims of attacks by blockaders to sue for damages as a result of such brutality. However, more can and must be done. The Schroeder amendment greatly assists in this regard.

This amendment would allow H.R. 728's local law enforcement block grant funding to be used to improve security measures at women's reproductive health care clinics to protect patients and providers against violence directed at the free exercise of their constitutional rights. This funding could be used for overtime pay for law enforcement officers, security assessments, and the purchase of materials, such as bulletproof glass, to enhance the physical safety of clinics.

Mr. Chairman, the most recent shootings in Massachusetts and Virginia accentuate the urgent need for action to further protect the safety and privacy of all individuals who support a woman's constitutional right to choose. We must continue to grant all levels of government the necessary authority to act when abortion protestors go beyond the legitimate exercise of their opinions to acts of terrorism and violence against those who have made different decisions.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HYDE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE: On page 9, strike lines 3 through 8, and insert the following

“(v) OVERSIGHT ACCOUNTABILITY AND ADMINISTRATION.—Not more than 3 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 2000 shall be available to the Attorney General for studying the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the provision of this title, and assuring compliance with the provisions of this title and for administrative costs to carry out the purposes of this title. The Attorney General shall establish and execute an oversight plan for monitoring the activities of grant recipients. Such sums are to remain available until expended.”

Mr. HYDE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the question of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] and myself. We both came up with almost the same idea and that was to provide funds to the Attorney General to oversee the compliance with this act by local units of government. And the idea of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] was to make sure that the programs they were overseeing were effective. So we put them both together in one amendment, and this provides that funds will be available to the Attorney General for studying the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the provisions of this title and assuring compliance with the provisions of this title and for administrative costs to carry out the purposes of this title.

The Attorney General shall establish and execute an oversight plan for monitoring the activities of grant recipients.

Now, not more than 3 percent of the amounts that are appropriated is to go to this fund, but it can be as much as \$60 million a year. That \$60 million would be given to the Attorney General, as I have said, to assure compliance and the welcome addition of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], effectiveness with the act and to carry out the purposes of the act.

The Attorney General must establish and execute an oversight plan, and I would say not because we do not trust local government but to ensure the success of the bill's intent.

I think this adds to the oversight requirement of this \$10 billion. I think it is a very useful amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] who is the cosponsor of this good amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and congratulate the gentleman from Illinois

for introducing it and working with me and others to have in it a provision that will review the effectiveness of these expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to spend \$30 billion fighting crime in these various bills. This amendment will ensure that that money is well spent. It provides for the evaluation of programs, which is extremely important so that other localities may get the benefit of the experience from some programs that work, and unfortunately, some programs that do not work.

So with this amendment, Mr. Chairman, we will see that this money is well spent. Localities can benefit from each other's experience, and that the actual prevention programs will actually go to preventing crime.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for introducing it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on our side, we are delighted that the cooperation has been worked out between the chairman and the gentleman from Virginia. We are delighted to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ACKERMAN

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ACKERMAN: Page 12, after line 7, add the following new paragraph:

"(10) PREFERENCE FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—The unit of local government has established procedures to give members of the Armed Forces who, on or after October 1, 1990, were or are selected for involuntary separation (as described in section 1141 of title 10, United States Code), approved for separation under section 1174a or 1175 of such title, or retired pursuant to the authority provided under section 4403 of the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance Act of 1992 (division D of Public Law 102-484; 10 U.S.C. 1293 note), a suitable preference in the employment of persons as additional law enforcement officers or support personnel using funds made available under this title. The nature and extent of such employment preference shall be jointly established by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense. To the extent practicable, the Director shall endeavor to inform members who were separated between October 1, 1990, and the date of the enactment of this section of their eligibility for the employment preference."

Mr. ACKERMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment to H.R. 738, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grant Act. My amendment employs a very innovative approach to tackling two very critical problems currently facing our Nation.

My amendment would assist in the fight against violent crime while also helping to alleviate the unemployment that has resulted from the downsizing of our Nation's military. Since the end of the cold war, thousands of members of the military have been involuntarily separated or have been released from active duty as wide scale downsizing has forced cutbacks in military personnel.

This amendment simply requires that local law enforcement agencies, in applying for grants under this bill, provide a preference for veterans who are victims of our downsized military as a condition of receiving funds for additional law enforcement officers.

Providing these former soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with meaningful employment, our communities will benefit from the experience and dedication that they have already demonstrated in serving our country.

What a great way to recruit people for our local police enforcing agencies. People who are in shape, people who are well trained, people who have experience with the use of firearms, young men and women who have a great deal of discipline. Bringing these veterans in from the cold to fight our domestic war on crime will let the enemy know how serious we are about crime and will not let their wanton acts go unpunished and that crime does not pay.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it makes good common sense.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the 5 minutes. I think the gentleman has offered a good amendment. I am prepared to accept it. I do want to make a couple of points about it, though.

First of all, as I read it, it provides that in order to get the funds, one of the qualifications that the unit of local government must have to give is that it has established procedures to give members of the Armed Forces that he has described, to give them a suitable preference in the employment of persons as additional law enforcement officers under the funds that are made available in this title.

The preference is going to be set forth as far as how it would work by the Department of Justice under the Attorney General and under the Secretary of Defense.

What I want to make clear is my reading of this does not indicate that the local units of government are required to hire armed services personnel who are retired, but if they come forward and they do apply and there is a notice provision in here for some notice to be given to those who are com-

ing out of the services, that they will be given a suitable preference to be determined based upon what the Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense have worked out, as well as the nature of what the local unit of government has.

I would like to make sure that my interpretation of this is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], to confirm that what I am stating is indeed the sense of his amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentleman's interpretation is absolutely correct. It does not require the hiring. It just creates a veterans' preference within the statute so that they would get a certain amount of points depending on the system that is used in the local municipality.

□ 1740

Mr. McCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, having gotten that assurance from the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to keep the time any longer. I will support the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN]. This is a provision that is used in other parts of the law already, and it tracks it. I think it is very important that we use this for giving suitable preference in the employment of persons as additional law enforcement officers, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and hope it will be unanimously agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SCHUMER. I do not believe the amendment is printed in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHUMER: Page 6, strike the word "or" on line 10, and insert the following after line 11:

"(6) consultants; or

"(7) vehicles not primarily used for law enforcement."

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple one. This basically puts some limitations on the wide-open nature of the Republican bill, H.R. 728. The problem, of course, is that the bill as drafted is so broad and so wide open, while things could be spent for a noble and worthwhile purpose, such as police or prevention programs, it could also be spent on anything under the Sun, and what we are

trying to do here is prevent that from happening.

Very simply, Mr. Chairman, in committee, a majority of the committee, although not the majority of the other party, prohibited tanks, airplanes, limousines, and yachts from being used for these funds. Why did we come up with examples like that? Very simply, the reason we came up with examples like that is that these types of things had actually been used.

Mr. Chairman, the now-Speaker of the House, then when he was a Member of Congress, said, and let me quote, and this is quoting from Speaker GINGRICH only 6 months ago, he said "If they say to me, in the name of fighting crime, will I send a \$2 billion check to cities, many of which have destructive bureaucracies, to let the local politicians build a bigger machine with more patronage, my answer is 'no.'"

The same day he said "If we have to choose between paying for a directed purpose, such as building prisons, I can defend that. What I cannot defend," and this is Speaker GINGRICH, "is sending a blank check to local politicians across the country for them to decide how to spend it."

Mr. Chairman, if there was anything that rebutted the presumption from the other side that this bill is good for America, it is Speaker GINGRICH's words 6 months ago.

What has changed? Are things any different? Most of the very same mayors and county officials who were in office then are in office now. They are the same local politicians across the country, and we should not send them or give them a blank check; Speaker GINGRICH's words. Yet, that is just what the majority party seeks to do in its bill.

What is going on here, Mr. Chairman? Something that had more restrictions on it a while ago, now, even broader, is perfectly OK. It does not add up. It does not make sense.

Speaker GINGRICH knew what he was talking about. The old LEAA program, which had less money and more restrictions than the Republican bill, paid for this. If Members cannot see it, it is an armored personnel carrier, an M113-A3, bought in Louisiana.

It paid for this, an airplane that was used to fly the Governor of Indiana around the country. In fact in one of its most famous trips, it went to Washington, DC, to pick up Moon rocks, a great law enforcement purpose. The LEAA Program was rescinded in disgrace.

Speaker GINGRICH was right. To send local politicians across the country a blank check makes no sense. Then why, Mr. Chairman, in the bill before us is that just what the majority party seeks to do? It does not add up.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have, and I could think of a long list of purposes that we should not spend this money on, but certainly consultants, why did I pick consultants? One-third, fully one-third of the

LEAA money, the old law enforcement money that had more restrictions than H.R. 728, more restrictions than H.R. 728, a third of the money was spent on consultants.

These consultants did not wear badges, did not have guns, did not put their lives in danger. It was pork.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, lots of other LEAA money was spent on vehicles for the emolument of local officials. That was pork. Let me say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, if we pass H.R. 728 without the amendments that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will offer this evening, and the gentleman from New York, I will offer tomorrow morning, we are looking for such trouble. We are looking for the kinds of pork that we have not seen for ages.

Mr. Chairman, the other side says "Send it all to the local governments," but Speaker GINGRICH was right. There are lots of local politicians who will misspend the money just as well as Federal politicians might.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has expired.

(At the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHUMER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is right. There are just as many local politicians who will waste and fritter away the taxpayers' money as there are Federal politicians.

What we seek to do in our proposals, Mr. Chairman, is simple. We say to the localities "Yes, we want you to spend the money on 100,000 new cops on the beat. We want you to spend the money on things like drug courts, but we do not want to let you fritter away all these dollars for anything you want."

I say to my colleagues who are thinking of voting for H.R. 728 without these amendments, take the wisdom of Speaker GINGRICH. He knew. He knew how bad it would be to put together a huge block grant with no, no restrictions on it. He knew in his wisdom that there would be planes that could be bought with this money.

Under the new Republican bill, until our amendment, planes could have still been bought; armored personnel carriers. Why some police officer in Louisiana needed an armored personnel carrier is beyond me, but much worse than that is the fact that the Federal Government let him buy it.

Under these provisions, they would be powerless to stop them. We could have the President, the Attorney General, the Speaker, the minority leader telling the locality "You cannot buy these things," but they would still have the right to buy them under H.R. 728.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the times where I agree with the Speaker. The Speaker is right. We should not be giving localities all the money they want for anything they want. He said

it, not 10 years ago, not 5 years ago, but in June 1994, a mere 8 months ago.

Mr. Chairman, let us all listen to him. Let us not be so wedded to a bill that was quickly drafted in the heat of the campaign last year, and instead, improve it, build upon the crime law, but not rip it up, start all over, and then rue the day.

That is my concluding comment to my colleagues. I would say to anyone who votes for this wide-open blank check to the localities, 2 or 3 years from now, they will live to regret it, because the amount of waste that will occur will be enormous.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is perfectly fine. I welcome the effort of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] in improving our bill. He has put forward two areas which probably should be cordoned off, or at least it would improve it to do that, consultants or vehicles not primarily used for law enforcement, as areas where we would not want them to spend the money.

We probably could think of a whole litany of things out here if we kept working at it. For the most part, he has covered all of them that he could think of that the LEAA which is ever accused of violating.

My own judgment is that the word "consultants" could probably use a definition somewhere in the definitions section. I am sure the gentleman would not want that term to include what is in the bill right now, and that is the fact that we may utilize the contracts that local units of government may have with private, non-profit entities or community-based organizations to carry out the purposes funded, to prohibit that phrase, if we indeed go to the term "consultant", because obviously, non-profit entities or community-based organizations would not be people we would not want to receive money under this bill.

□ 1750

So I think the term consultant perhaps needs to be defined, but I understand what the gentleman is getting at.

What I would just like to comment on during the brief time I am up here on this amendment is that LEAA, the law enforcement assistance program of years past that the Democrats are so fond of saying is very similar to this, it is going to be abused again, we are going to be abused by this process, was quite different from what we are dealing with today.

First of all, that program was designed specifically for innovation and experimentation. In fact, the moneys that went to the states and not to the local communities in that case, though the States may have given some of that money to them, that money was specified by us to be used only for experimental or innovative practices. It was designed to require that the States

and the local communities in spending that for law enforcement purposes be creative. They could not spend it for routine law enforcement or tried-and-true law enforcement procedures and they could not spend it for what we would consider to be prevention programs today. That is quite a different matter from what we have got forward in this bill.

I would say that when you are charging them with coming up with new ideas and experimenting and putting a lot of money out there, maybe the past Congresses that passed it should have been wise enough to have foreseen that you were charging them with going off and trying to find new ways to spend money that would involve some things that would be pretty absurd at times because they could not spend it for normal law enforcement practices.

However, this bill today that we have before us is designed in just the opposite fashion. We do not have a problem with some creativity, but it is open-ended in the sense that local communities may spend this money for anything which will help them fight crime in their local communities. I would submit that since we have an advisory board specifically set up that include a broad range of local community to decide what is best for that community and we have elected local officials making these decisions as bodies, not individually, but we have the county commissions and the city commissions making them, it is far less likely that the moneys will be spent on absurd projects under this bill than may have been under the old LEAA program which is quite different.

Plus the fact under this legislation we have got all kinds of accounting checks and reporting requirements and oversight by the Comptroller General that is involved. So I would submit that it is highly improbable that this money will be misspent and that the program that we are seeking to accomplish here, the fighting of crime in the local communities, by its very nature requires giving this discretion to local governments, because Washington certainly does not know best how to fight crime which is 90 percent or better a local problem under local criminal laws.

I submit that what is good for any community on the West Coast is not necessarily good for one in the South or the Midwest, or who knows? Every community is different. It is absurd for us to try to dictate to those communities how to do it.

The very nature of providing flexibility contains within it the inherent risk that upon occasion, some local unit of government, some officials of government, elected by the people in their local communities, will act irresponsibly, will act in ways that you and I would not like them to do, and I fully expect that that is going to happen in a very tiny fraction of the cases where this money goes out. I would be remiss in not saying it is going to happen.

But I think that the risk of that happening and the occasional misdeeds that will occur because local elected officials are not responsible in some cases is going to be far outweighed by the good that is done, by the flexibility that is provided in this legislation as opposed to what was there in the last Congress.

What we had in the last Congress was far too narrow. It passed in a way that many local communities cannot take advantage of it. We had categorical grants saying, "If you follow these things and do just this stuff, then you can get the money for these prevention programs, but you can't do it, for other prevention programs that might be better for your communities, you can't get any money for that."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. In the Cops on the Street Program, we said, "Here is how you are going to go about it. If you have this matching grant program, 75 percent of the money will be paid for by the Federal Government for the first \$20,000 or \$25,000 to hire a new cop." Since the average cost of a new cop is about \$60,000 a year to hire him and outfit him and put him out on the street, for 3 years we did pay a small fraction but not nearly as much as a cop costs for that period of time. Then after the 3 years, the local community had to pay 100 percent of it if they submitted for a grant. We have found that in the process of the first few months of this grant program under last year's Cops on the Street Program, a lot of communities are saying to us, "We can't afford to do that. We're not going to take advantage of it."

So our flexible approach is far better and the downsides to it are minuscule compared to the upsides and the positive approach the Republicans are offering today in this bill to let the local, county and city governments of this Nation spend \$10 billion to fight crime at the highest crime rate level cities and communities around the country in the way that they best see fit and know how.

I, therefore, commend the gentleman for this amendment, it is a fine improvement, but I think his points other than that were not well-taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is raising problems with LEAA. We agree it had problems. But what Speaker GINGRICH was referring to in these quotes was not the

LEAA. It was the LPA, the Local Partnership Act which was in last year's bill which was virtually the same thing as the block grant proposed this year. So I would like to ask the gentleman, when the Speaker says, "What I cannot defend is sending a blank check to local politicians across the country for them to decide how to spend it," how is the program in H.R. 728 any different than that quote from the Speaker? Where is the difference?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I can say to the gentleman that first of all the Local Partnership Act grant is \$1.5 billion to the highest tax rate cities, not the highest crime rate cities.

Second, I did not hear the Speaker say that, I do not know the context in which it was said, and I cannot defend him one way or the other today about that comment.

But I would say to you that whatever he said, the fact of the matter is that the broad programs we are offering today provide the widest latitude of flexibility and conform the most to Republican principles of letting that government govern best which governs closest to the people. That is the local, county, and city governments. Consequently, when it is spread out to all of the governments to participate in, not just a narrow few as were under that LPA grant for \$1.5 billion who were the highest tax rate cities in the country, we have a far different scenario than what we had in that bill last Congress.

I think that whatever else is said about this, we are going to let every community in this country participate that has a crime rate problem, and it is a very positive improvement over last year's bill which was very narrow in scope with each of the categorical grant programs, as well as very narrow in scope of the conditions that were placed with regard to the cops on the street program which thousands of communities, including Oklahoma City for one, cannot participate in, say they cannot.

So I accept the gentleman's amendment but I do not accept his premise.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to give some more examples and make some more arguments, but at the conclusion of the comments of the gentleman from Florida, I am going to save them, because we are prepared to accept the amendment at this time.

I commend the gentleman. We already have several items included. It was thought that consultants ought to be added, and I think the gentleman may want to indicate how we might even qualify that further.

I yield to him at this point.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would be happy.

The gentleman from Florida makes a good suggestion. That is, that we make sure that consultants do not include nonprofit community organizations

that are involved in crime fighting itself, and I would suggest we do that in report language.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a great idea. We will take care of that, because it is true that sometimes community organizations do end up in a consulting capacity, and that is the last thing in our minds to in any way limit or inhibit their working under the provisions of this bill.

With that, I indicate my support for the amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I guess the gentleman from Florida is gone. But I would just say, everything he is talking about did not answer the question, in all due respect to him. He was talking about the Speaker's language saying you cannot send the localities a blank check.

□ 1800

The gentleman from Florida is saying it is correct to send the localities a blank check, and I do not see how to defend that in any way other than it is a 180 degree turn, and some of the frustration we on this side have is that it seems a lot of what is in the contract, particularly on the crime bill, was not really designed to improve the crime bill. Anyone who thought this so convincingly in June would not draft something that was a blank check. I would argue to my colleague that it was simply done as a way of saying well, I am different and it is a bad way to go, and let us forget that mistake and let us go forward and pass something that makes sense.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding. Again I stand by the fact that Speaker GINGRICH said open block grants to communities is a blank check, we should not to it. And now we have a complete reversal. I say he was right then, he is wrong now.

Mr. CONYERS. In addition, of course, this combines police grants, so what we are having now is a choice between every kind of prevention and nonprevention you ever imagined, plus the opportunity to not use police because there is not a separate category for community policing.

I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment printed in the RECORD?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. It is not Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina: Page 21, after line 16, insert the following:

"(7) In no event shall the term 'improving public safety' be interpreted to allow the use of any funds appropriated under this title for the construction or improvement of highways, streets or roads."

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, a real problem I have with this bill has been illustrated by the last amendment which was adopted, and that is the question of how the bill is drafted.

It leaves the field wide open for interpretation of about anything at the local level to be eligible for funding under this bill.

The particular place which this amendment is designed to address is throughout the bill where amounts are to be paid to units of local government for improving public safety. There is no definition in the bill for what improving public safety means. In my congressional district there are some cities is that when we talk about public safety the first thing that they go to is not crime in the neighborhoods, police on the streets, or something of that kind, but public safety has the connotation of increased traffic, roads, streets, something that will help to improve the flow of traffic in and around the city.

Let me make it clear that I do not have any problem with improving subject safety by building more streets or improving highways or improving roads, but in this particular bill, which is a crime bill, there should be no question that these funds should not be eligible for being used in that way.

So I thought we better have something in the bill that gave some definition to this concept of improving public safety. I thought about trying to come up with a definition for improving public safety, and I really had some serious problems trying to draft the language that would cover that issue without creating more problems than I solved. So instead of trying to craft a definition for improving public safety, I at least thought we ought to back out this one element that could be interpreted as a means of improving public safety. In fact, it does improve public safety to improve the streets and roads and highways in a particular city. And I do not have any problem with that. But I could not come up with a crafted way, an ingenuous way to define improving public safety, which is really one of the problems that I have with this bill.

I do not think the local officials are going to be able to, we are not going to be able to tell the local officials at the local level what improving public safety means any more than we can define that term in the bill.

So, we have this broad, open, three words, "improving public safety" that we could about convert to any kind of construction or definition or interpretation that local government officials want to put it to, and that is a serious problem in this bill. At least if this

amendment is adopted it will be clear that it is not a traffic bill that we are dealing with here, it is serious crime, or crime unrelated to traffic, even though there is nothing here in my amendment that would remove the funding from drunk driving or criminal activity other than traffic offenses.

But I would just say to my colleagues here that as the bill is drafted now, traffic offenses and trying to solve problems of traffic in cities could just as easily fall under the category of improving public safety as criminal conduct, and I encourage my colleagues to please support the amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I rise to oppose his amendment. The gentleman from Florida who is our subcommittee chairman I believe accepted the last amendment because there is or at least there was some demonstrated abuse of funds under the former law enforcement administration that dealt with grants for the purpose of fighting crime.

However, the fact of the matter is that we wanted to make that recognition, I will still take our approach in this bill of block grants over the micromanagement that is in the crime bill that passed last year. More specifically with respect to this amendment, when the gentleman said, "in no event shall the term improving public safety be interpreted to allow the use of any funds under this title for construction or improvement of the highways, streets or roads," I would first of all say the reference to improving public safety is taken out of the paragraph that he says reduce crime and improve public safety as the purpose of the bill. And more specifically to roads, I would point out that one of the reasons to authorize the payment of funds in the crime bill that passed last year is increasing lighting within or adjacent to public transportation systems, including bus stops, subway stations, parking lots or garages, so that could be viewed under the gentleman's amendment as improving a road in such a way that would not be allowed.

We have already allowed in the crime bill that crime occurs in roads and streets, like highway robbery, if you will, carjacking and so forth, and there could be action taken towards a street or road which a community does believe is for the purpose of reducing crime and improving public safety.

For that reason I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I am surprised to hear the gentleman concede that funds under this bill could in fact be used to improve roads and highways and streets. I thought clearly that was not a purpose of this bill.

Is the gentleman sure that he wants to concede that point?

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time, I do not think that is what I said to the gentleman from North Carolina. I pointed out that a provision of funding in the crime bill that passed last year allows increased lighting for roads, and under the gentleman's amendment that could be interpreted that the improvement in lighting is some kind of improvement to a road that is not allowed, when the improvement in lighting was found by its inclusion in this bill, last year's crime bill to be for the purpose of fighting crime.

I just want to say that the gentleman is taking this out of context. The purpose of grants, block grants are for the purpose of reducing crime and improving public safety, and we believe that local officials that do not use the funds for that purpose are not going to be local officials for much longer.

I yield again to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I want to make three quick points in response. First of all, the one instance the gentleman has referred to where there is a reference to reducing crime and improving public safety is on page 2.

□ 1810

But I would point out to the gentleman that on page 6 there is a provision dealing with maintenance of public safety which is not connected with reducing crime in any way, and there are other examples in this bill where improving public safety is used. So I think the gentleman is mistaken in that respect.

Second, I have made no argument about lighting. My amendment goes to streets, roads, and highways, and if there is something in last year's bill about lighting at bus stops, I would not think that would related to either roads, highways, or streets, and if we are superseding last year's crime bill, then I am not sure why we would be debating that issue anyway. Because this language, I would think, goes beyond last year's crime bill.

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time, I just want to point out again that improved lighting for a street could, under the gentleman's amendment, be determined to be improving that street and, therefore, not allowed under our bill.

But I want to steer back to the central idea of this bill, H.R. 728. We are going to trust the local communities. Nobody has denied on our side that not all of the past experiences have been perfect in that regard.

But when compared to the experience of Washington micromanagement, it is a whole lot better, and that is why I urge defeat of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the problems with this whole process is it does not seem as if we fully understand what happens in the local municipalities and the local processes as it relates to budgeting, and that is even more important as we consider the fact that at every level there are reductions in budgets as various mayors try to find the best means of resolving their budget conflicts.

All over this country today there are those who are trying to bridge the gap that they might be able to provide a level of service but, at the same time, deal with the reality that they cannot tax themselves out of problems that are endemic to the cities. In so doing, a community, a block grant for police, a block grant for anything, represents the potential as a tool to be used in almost any way to be able to try to bridge those budget gaps.

I think a classic example may well be as we consider what has happened with community development block grants. They were intended for the purpose of insuring that many of these urban communities were rebuilt. In point of fact, in too many instances, those community block grants are nothing more than the difference between what it takes for a city to be able to not have to go out to the bond market and for it to balance its budget by the use of Federal resources. I think we all would have to agree that any local politician who is concerned about the next election, seeing the resources that are now available to them in a community block grant over which they have absolute control, with no direction from Washington, with no mandates in terms of how those funds would be spent, could easily provide justification that what they are spending the money for is, in fact, in the interest of public safety.

If you consider what we are talking about and the number of bills that are before us, the number of bills that will be before us in the next few days, when you talk about welfare reform, when you talk about not providing people a decent kind of wage on which to live, when you talk about all the conditions that are endemic to the schools and other circumstances in these communities, you are doing to drive more people onto the kind of census that makes up this ever growing prison population. While you are doing that, you could easily make arguments then that your justification for spending money in various areas that are not defined within the bill might well fit within the rubric of public safety.

I think what we are doing, in fact, is giving to those who are local representatives in government an opportunity to have before them resources that would not otherwise be available. They will do as they have done with the community development block grants, they will not use the money for policing issues, they will not use the money for public safety issues, they will use the

money to be able to bridge that budget gap.

If you look farther at community development block grants in some major cities where they have taken those moneys not to create housing, not to be able to rebuild communities, not to economic development vehicles, rather, they have used those moneys so they might provide in some instances security, housing that is warehoused by the city, that would not be considered within the interest of development of housing. I could see likewise one can just as easily argue you could make those funds available for providing security in areas the city would otherwise have to do it, but now would not have to do it by virtue of the fact that they have the benefit of a community block grant.

These block grants are nothing more than a giveaway. It is a form of welfare. It is a form of a subsidy that allows for somebody who is in power who has the authority over a budget to say this is where I want the money to be targeted and, you know as well as I do, and I am a former educator, I can tell you if you give me a few minutes and you give me a lot of money and knowing that dollars are fungible, I will figure out a way to make those dollars usable for whatever I can justify them to be usable for. That is what we are making available for the cities, and we need to stand and be honest about that.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. I wonder is the gentleman saying he opposes community development block grants?

Mr. FLAKE. I oppose community development block grants that are given to those who are in power who do not do what those community block grants are designated to do, and in too many instances, there is a history that community block grants do not do what we have historically designed them to do when we have made community block grants available from Washington.

Mr. SCHIFF. If the gentleman will yield further, either community development block grants exist or they do not. Is the gentleman in favor of repealing the whole issue of community development block grants?

Mr. FLAKE. I would not repeal the whole issue of community development block grants. What I would do though is set some specific mandates on how those funds are being used as is the case with the amendment that is before us right now where it says there are specific things you can do and specific things you cannot do, because as we try to solve a particular problem, the block grant is developed for that reason, for that reason alone.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we know the difference between improving lighting

and improving the roads, and improving the lighting would have a significant impact on crime in an area and could be supported.

I know many localities trying to build roads who would be praised for spending this money on road building rather than crime fighting. This funding is for crime prevention, and thankfully we did have some money put into the bill a few minutes ago which would have the effect of evaluating programs for their effectiveness in preventing crime. But road building is one where we would not have to wait for the evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would adopt the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to reemphasize the point that I simply do not understand why there would be opposition to this amendment. There is nobody, I think, on this floor or in this Congress who thinks that the purpose of this bill is to improve roads, highways, or streets. And yet the language in the bill, improving public safety, is clearly broad enough to cover that kind of activity.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why we make an issue of this simply to send a message to the public. I guess that we have crafted the perfect bill, and our language cannot be improved; surely, the proponents of this bill, the sponsors of this bill, do not believe they have crafted a perfect bill, and I just for the life of me cannot understand the opposition to this amendment.

I would ask my colleagues to, please, be sensible about this. Make this clear. There are enough loopholes and gaps in this bill without leaving this loophole and gap for local communities to drive through.

I can tell you that in some areas traffic is the major issue that is affecting the people, and there is no problem with addressing the issue of traffic.

But let us do it in a transportation bill, in a roads bill. Let us not leave open the opportunity to address that concern in what we are calling a crime bill in the name of just the sense that they have some perfect bill here. It is not a perfect bill. There are all kinds of problems with this bill, and this is just one of them.

We ought to at least close this one gap.

□ 1838

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that

I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No 119]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—417

Abercrombie	Cooley	Gordon
Ackerman	Costello	Goss
Allard	Cox	Graham
Andrews	Coyne	Green
Archer	Cramer	Greenwood
Arney	Crane	Gunderson
Bachus	Creameans	Gutierrez
Baessler	Cubin	Gutknecht
Baker (CA)	Cunningham	Hall (OH)
Baker (LA)	Danner	Hall (TX)
Baldacci	Davis	Hamilton
Ballenger	Deal	Hancock
Barcia	DeFazio	Hansen
Barr	DeLauro	Harman
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Hastert
Barrett (WI)	Dellums	Hastings (FL)
Bartlett	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bass	Dickey	Hayworth
Bateman	Dicks	Hefley
Beilenson	Dingell	Hefner
Bentsen	Dixon	Heineman
Bereuter	Doggett	Herger
Berman	Dooley	Hilleary
Bevill	Doolittle	Hilliard
Bilbray	Dornan	Hinchey
Bilirakis	Doyle	Hobson
Bishop	Dreier	Hoekstra
Bliley	Duncan	Hoke
Blute	Dunn	Holden
Boehlert	Durbin	Horn
Boehner	Edwards	Hosettler
Bonilla	Ehlers	Houghton
Bonior	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Bono	Emerson	Hunter
Borski	Engel	Hutchinson
Boucher	English	Hyde
Brewster	Ensign	Inglis
Browder	Eshoo	Istook
Brown (CA)	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Brown (FL)	Everett	Jacobs
Brown (OH)	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Brownback	Farr	Johnson (SD)
Bryant (TN)	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Bunn	Fawell	Johnston
Bunning	Fazio	Jones
Burr	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski
Burton	Fields (TX)	Kaptur
Buyer	Filner	Kasich
Callahan	Flake	Kelly
Calvert	Flanagan	Kennedy (MA)
Camp	Foglietta	Kennedy (RI)
Canady	Foley	Kennelly
Cardin	Forbes	Kildee
Castle	Ford	Kim
Chabot	Fowler	King
Chambliss	Fox	Kingston
Chenoweth	Franks (CT)	Klecaska
Christensen	Franks (NJ)	Klink
Chrysler	Frelinghuysen	Klug
Clay	Frisa	Knollenberg
Clayton	Funderburk	Kolbe
Clement	Furse	LaFalce
Clinger	Gallely	LaHood
Clyburn	Ganske	Lantos
Coble	Gejdenson	Largent
Coburn	Gekas	Latham
Coleman	Gephardt	LaTourette
Collins (GA)	Gilchrest	Laughlin
Collins (IL)	Gillmor	Lazio
Collins (MI)	Gilman	Leach
Combest	Gonzalez	Levin
Condit	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Conyers	Goodling	Lewis (GA)

Lewis (KY)	Packard	Smith (NJ)
Lightfoot	Pallone	Smith (TX)
Lincoln	Parker	Smith (WA)
Linder	Pastor	Solomon
Lipinski	Paxon	Souder
Livingston	Payne (NJ)	Spence
LoBiondo	Payne (VA)	Spratt
Lofgren	Pelosi	Stark
Longley	Peterson (FL)	Stearns
Lowe	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Lucas	Petri	Stockman
Luther	Pickett	Stokes
Maloney	Pombo	Studds
Manton	Pomeroy	Stump
Manzullo	Porter	Stupak
Markey	Portman	Talent
Martinez	Poshard	Tanner
Martini	Pryce	Tate
Mascara	Quillen	Tauzin
McCarthy	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
McCollum	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Rahall	Tejeda
McDade	Ramstad	Thomas
McDermott	Rangel	Thompson
McHale	Reed	Thornberry
McHugh	Regula	Thornton
McInnis	Reynolds	Thurman
McIntosh	Richardson	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rivers	Torkildsen
McKinney	Roberts	Torres
McNulty	Roemer	Torricelli
Meehan	Rogers	Towns
Meek	Rohrabacher	Traffant
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Metcalf	Rose	Velazquez
Meyers	Roth	Vento
Mfume	Roukema	Visclosky
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Volkmer
Miller (CA)	Royce	Vucanovich
Miller (FL)	Rush	Waldholtz
Mineta	Sabo	Walker
Minge	Salmon	Walsh
Mink	Sanders	Wamp
Moakley	Sanford	Ward
Molinar	Sawyer	Waters
Mollohan	Saxton	Watt (NC)
Montgomery	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Moorhead	Schaefer	Waxman
Morella	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Myers	Schroeder	Weldon (PA)
Myrick	Schumer	Weller
Nadler	Scott	White
Neal	Seastrand	Whitfield
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Neumann	Serrano	Williams
Ney	Shadegg	Wise
Norwood	Shaw	Wolf
Nussle	Shays	Woolsey
Oberstar	Shuster	Wyden
Obey	Sisisky	Wynn
Olver	Skaggs	Yates
Ortiz	Skeen	Young (AK)
Orton	Skelton	Young (FL)
Owens	Slaughter	Zeliff
Oxley	Smith (MI)	Zimmer

□ 1839

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred seventeen Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

□ 1840

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business before the House is the demand of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

AYES—194

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Boucher
Ackerman	Bereuter	Brewster
Andrews	Berman	Browder
Baessler	Bevill	Brown (CA)
Barcia	Bishop	Brown (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Brown (OH)
Beilenson	Borski	Bryant (TX)

Cardin	Inglis	Peterson (MN)
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
Clayton	Jacobs	Pomeroy
Clement	Johnson (CT)	Poshard
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Coleman	Johnston	Rangel
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Reed
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Reynolds
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Richardson
Conyers	Kennelly	Rivers
Costello	Kildee	Roemer
Coyne	Klecicka	Rose
Cramer	LaFalce	Roukema
de la Garza	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Laughlin	Rush
DeLauro	Lazio	Sabo
Dellums	Levin	Sanders
Deutscher	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Dicks	Lincoln	Schroeder
Dingell	Lipinski	Schumer
Dixon	LoBlundo	Scott
Doggett	Lofgren	Serrano
Dooley	Lowey	Sisisky
Duncan	Luther	Skaggs
Durbin	Maloney	Skelton
Edwards	Manton	Slaughter
Engel	Markey	Spratt
Eshoo	Martinez	Stark
Evans	McCarthy	Stenholm
Farr	McDermott	Stokes
Fattah	McKinney	Studds
Fazio	McNulty	Stupak
Fields (LA)	Meehan	Tanner
Filner	Menendez	Tauzin
Flake	Meyers	Taylor (MS)
Foglietta	Mfume	Tejeda
Ford	Miller (CA)	Thompson
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Thornton
Frost	Minge	Thurman
Furse	Mink	Torres
Gedensson	Moakley	Torricelli
Gephardt	Mollohan	Towns
Gonzalez	Montgomery	Traficant
Gordon	Moran	Velazquez
Green	Morella	Vento
Greenwood	Nadler	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Neal	Volkmer
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Ward
Hall (TX)	Obey	Waters
Hamilton	Olver	Watt (NC)
Harman	Ortiz	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Wise
Hayes	Owens	Woolsey
Hefley	Pastor	Wyden
Hefner	Payne (NJ)	Wynn
Hilliard	Payne (VA)	Yates
Hinchey	Pelosi	Zimmer
Hoyer	Peterson (FL)	

NOES—230

Allard	Coble	Gallegly
Archer	Coburn	Ganske
Armey	Collins (GA)	Gekas
Bachus	Combust	Gilchrest
Baker (CA)	Cooley	Gillmor
Baker (LA)	Cox	Gilman
Baldacci	Crane	Goodlatte
Ballenger	Cremeans	Goodling
Barr	Cubin	Goss
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Graham
Bartlett	Danner	Gunderson
Barton	Davis	Gutknecht
Bass	Deal	Hancock
Bateman	DeLay	Hansen
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Bilirakis	Dickey	Hastings (WA)
Bliley	Doolittle	Hayworth
Blute	Dornan	Heineman
Boehlert	Doyle	Herger
Boehner	Dreier	Hilleary
Bonilla	Dunn	Hobson
Bono	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Brownback	Ehrlich	Hoke
Bryant (TN)	Emerson	Holden
Bunn	English	Horn
Bunning	Ensign	Hostettler
Burr	Everett	Houghton
Burton	Ewing	Hunter
Buyer	Fawell	Hutchinson
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Hyde
Calvert	Flanagan	Istook
Camp	Foley	Johnson (SD)
Canady	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Fowler	Jones
Chabot	Fox	Kanjorski
Chambliss	Franks (CT)	Kasich
Chenoweth	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Christensen	Frelinghuysen	Kim
Chrysler	Frisa	King
Clinger	Funderburk	Kingston

Klink	Ney	Skeen
Klug	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Knollenberg	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Kolbe	Oxley	Smith (TX)
LaHood	Packard	Smith (WA)
Largent	Pallone	Solomon
Latham	Parker	Souder
LaTourette	Paxon	Spence
Leach	Petri	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Stockman
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Stump
Lightfoot	Portman	Talent
Linder	Pryce	Tate
Livingston	Quillen	Taylor (NC)
Longley	Quinn	Thomas
Lucas	Radanovich	Thornberry
Manzullo	Ramstad	Tiahrt
Martini	Regula	Torkildsen
Mascara	Riggs	Upton
McCollum	Roberts	Vucanovich
McCrery	Rogers	Waldholtz
McDade	Rohrabacher	Walker
McHale	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McHugh	Roth	Wamp
McInnis	Royce	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
McKeon	Sanford	Weldon (PA)
Metcalfe	Saxton	Weller
Mica	Scarborough	White
Miller (FL)	Schaefer	Whitfield
Molinari	Schiff	Wicker
Moorhead	Seastrand	Williams
Murtha	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Myers	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Myrick	Shaw	Young (FL)
Nethercutt	Shays	Zeliff
Neumann	Shuster	

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Gibbons	Tucker
Chapman	Jefferson	Wilson
Crapo	Matsui	
Geren	Meek	

□ 1846

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1850

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for recognizing me for 5 minutes. I normally do not take a vote on an issue personally, but I think I need to say some things to this body.

Mr. Chairman, I came earlier today and offered the amendment that just failed to the leadership on the majority side in an effort to try to work with the majority leadership to improve this bill. There is not a person in this House who believes that this money should be used to build streets, roads or highways. There is not a Member of this House who believes that the funds under this bill ought to be used for highways, roads or streets. And I tried to offer this amendment in such a way just to clarify that issue. And I won the voice vote.

During the course of the debate on the rule, I pointed out to the Members of this body and to the American people that the time required to come over here and vote on an amendment is included in the 10 hours of public debate time that is allocated for this bill.

Immediately before I had offered my amendment, the other side had just agreed to an amendment similar to this. So I am beginning to wonder here what is going on in this body. We are marching in lockstep, doing things that make no sense in the context of public policy, denying Members that

right to clarify the wording of a bill, maybe taking out personal animosities and concerns from last week on the content of this bill, because this vote makes no sense in the context of what we are doing here.

I want to just make it clear to my colleagues over here, if this vote is designed to send a message to MEL WATT, which I am inclined to think that it is, as I speak here, I will tell them that I will send a number of amendments that they will not like for their consideration. If they want to single me out and discipline me by calling for a vote on something that everybody in the House agrees to and tell their soldiers to march, contrary to public policy, contrary to what everybody in this House knows the intent of this bill is, then somebody have enough nerve to come to my face and tell me that. Because if they want to declare war, then I am up to it, and I will tell them that I am ready to start the war right here.

But I will not be personally insulted. I will not be personally singled out. And I will not have them march like toy soldiers on issues of public policy without exposing what they are doing to the American people.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is saying is, maybe some of the Members did not quite understand, what I understand what he is saying is that an amendment that previously delineated what they meant was accepted by the other side; correct?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. And this amendment, which really, I think, is clear to everybody, I do not think, surely, maybe there is, maybe the gentleman is a little wrong, maybe they really want to use this money, crime fighting money, for roads and highways and streets. Maybe the gentleman missed the boat. Maybe that is really the way they want to use the money. But it does not appear that that would be a proper use of it. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WATT of North Carolina was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if that is not so, then the only purpose of them asking for the vote and taking all the time is because, the gentleman feels, it was he that offered the amendment. In other words, perhaps if it was someone else that offered the amendment, the amendment may have been accepted.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Perhaps I should let the gentleman offer the next amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. I do not think I am in any better shape than the gentleman is.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Well, perhaps I should select somebody else of another hue to offer the amendment.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from North Carolina, who offered the amendment, felt that my opposition to it was based in some way in some personal fashion. I would point out that in the last vote, 12 of my party voted with the gentleman and 14 Members of his party voted with me against it.

I want to make two points. First of all, if we have misjudged the situation, I cannot say, but we had received ideas that amendment after amendment after amendment was going to be offered. We have seen drafts that included no purchase of rocket launchers, no purchase of farm equipment.

Now the majority party in the Committee on the Judiciary helped to pass an amendment to this bill which provided several limitations such as the gentleman from North Carolina is talking about. We said things like no purchase of limousines and no fixed wing aircraft, and so forth.

Second of all, the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of our subcommittee, accepted an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], which said no use of consultants and no use of unconventional vehicles for the police department.

The point is, our belief was these amendments were going to come endlessly, not necessarily for their individual merit, but to make the general point that there are Members here who do not approve of the block grant approach and intend to oppose this bill no matter how many amendments are accepted.

We accepted some amendments as an acknowledgment that, in fact, there have been past problems with block grants. Most of us continue to support H.R. 728 because we think the block grant is still appropriate when compared to Washington and congressional micromanagement.

My point is that nothing here was designed or intended to be personal to the gentleman from North Carolina in any way. It was just to stop what we thought was a flurry of these amendments, duplicative in spirit, if not in letter.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I have to say, with the utmost regard to the gentleman from North Carolina, I want to say that this particular amendment was a mistake. When we say that no money can be used for roads, that could be no lighting to improve security, it could mean no rerouting of traffic to prevent gang attacks and to prevent carjackings.

I was given one example by the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] of a road built to a county jail.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I tried to discuss this item. I crossed over the aisle and discussed it with the gentleman from North Carolina. I did have a concern and I think that that kind of communication was nothing personal on my vote. I was not in lockstep.

The fact is that we built an \$800 million facility trying to fight crime in the county of San Diego, and one of the major problems we had, too, is that we had to spend over a million dollars to get from the adjoining road to the site where we could build this facility.

Now, I am sure my colleague from North Carolina did not mean to create that kind of barrier from being able to utilize these resources for different types of crime activity, but this was one that was a good example of where there would have been a legitimate facility built, legitimate expense that would have been blocked by his amendment.

□ 1900

That is why I voted, not because I was in lockstep on this side of the aisle, but because, from practical application, I saw that this could be a barrier from doing what the bill wants us to accomplish, and that is fighting crime.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in conclusion once again that it was our belief we would be debating these amendments for the entire 10 hours of this bill, which essentially made the same point over and over again, which we think we have recognized in accepting the amendments we have offered.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, I believe this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] inadvertently, I am sure, would have precluded legitimate uses of law enforcement money.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] has made just the point that we on this side of the aisle wish to make, which is if there was a need for a road, even if the road would be used by law enforcement personnel, there are State funds to do that, there are Federal highway funds to do that, et cetera.

The very point is, Mr. Chairman, in this large block grant concept, we could stretch the definition so far that we could do almost anything, and the money would be so dissipated that the actual bang for the buck in law enforcement would be next to nothing. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] was very well advised. I do not care if there is a road going from one prison to another. If you ask the American people "Should the money in the crime bill, whether it be a Democratic crime bill,

a Republican bill, or a bipartisan crime bill, go to building roads from one place to another, no matter what the purpose?" they would overwhelmingly say no. That is the very reason the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] makes the point that we wish to make, the gentleman from North Carolina, myself, and all of us on this side of the aisle. That is that the block grant proposition, despite good intentions, it will pave the road, so to speak, for all sorts of kinds of things that will be built with this money that no one had any idea of, that have nothing to do with real law enforcement, and it will end up being a gigantic, big barrel of pork.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WISE: At page 4, after line 19, insert

(G) "Enhance programs under subpart 1 of part E of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, we have been talking to the majority. I believe it will be acceptable. This amendment is very simple. It simply says that for purposes of the block grant, that the local governments can use the block grant for the same purposes that they presently receive Byrne funds for. The Byrne grant is authorized under a separate law. The Byrne grant begins its appropriations, or its authorized amount begins to be reduced each of the next years up until the year 2000. What this simply says is that for those programs that local governments have found useful, and there are 22 of them that are permissible under the Byrne grant, for those programs that they can use the block grant moneys for those Byrne programs.

To give some examples, in West Virginia, for instance, one of the most successful programs has been the DARE, drug abuse resistance education programs. Byrne moneys can be used there. Police officers teach the DARE Program. Another one that has been very helpful, and I think goes right to the heart of what the majority bill hopes to do, is the multijurisdictional drug task force. Once again, Byrne moneys can be used to bring, in rural areas particularly, to bring the many county and local governments together, working with the State and Federal authorities in ways that they have not been able to do today to work on drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this be approved and that the amendment be adopted which would permit the 22 purposes of the Byrne grant, that the local governments be able to use the block grant moneys here to implement those programs.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's program is excellent. We support it. We already have, as Members know, the Byrne grant programs. The fact of the matter is this was never intended, our bill, to in any way keep programs that have Byrne grant program funds from receiving additional moneys out of this bill. There is total flexibility for the States to do that.

The gentleman's amendment guarantees that. I support it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent amendment. The gentleman is attempting to reimpose some needed structure to the completely unmanageable and formless way the block grant programs are structured, so I commend the gentleman. I think we will accept it unanimously on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to inform the membership that it is the intention of the Chair, to the best of his ability, to rotate recognition for the purpose of offering amendments between Republican and Democrat.

It was the mistaken belief of the Chair that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] was seeking time to strike the requisite number of words. Obviously he was seeking time of offer an amendment. Therefore, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] should have been recognized first.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARTINI

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTINI: Page 8, after line 19, insert the following new subsection:

“(h) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this title may not exceed 90 percent of the costs of a program or proposal funded under this title.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a member of the Republican Task Force on Crime to offer an amendment that I believe is essential if this House wants to make sure the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act, H.R. 728, is a credible program to fight crime.

As written, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 728 is a good bill. Block grants will combine the extra resources our communities need to combat crime with the added flexibility to use that money in ways that best suit them.

I support the bill, Mr. Chairman, and believe it brings us a long way toward our goal. However, Mr. Chairman, we can make a good bill even better, in my opinion. The localities are being given the money without having to put up any of their own funds.

With no direct financial stake in the program, I fear many local governments will not officially use the money we offer them. If the program is a waste, they lose nothing. It is a classic case of easy come, easy go.

The amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and I seeks to address this problem by implementing a matching provision in which local governments will be required to put up 10 percent of the grant they receive. Even this small matching amount will protect the integrity of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Chairman, as a former local official on both the county and municipal level, I know these kinds of matching provisions bring accountability to local units of government. It is accountability that this amendment seeks to do.

The 10 percent matching provision is not as large as those contained in last year's crime bill, and the amendment does not infringe at all upon the wise latitude given the localities that is the cornerstone of H.R. 728.

Mr. Chairman, this year this House has taken many actions to preserve for our constituents and to tell our constituents that we understand their money is a scarce resource, and we can no longer afford to spend it on wasteful projects.

It is not that I begrudge the amount of money in block grants this bill proposes; rather, fighting crime is one of the most important functions of our government, and I wish we could afford to spend more in this area.

What the Martini-Castle amendment does do is force localities to be as careful with their Federal money as we have committed ourselves to be with the Federal taxpayers' dollars. Even the smallest amount of investment made by a locality will give local officials a stake in the success or failure of a program, and help assure us that our block grants are being put to good use.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and strengthen what is already a very good bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTINI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, under the gentleman's amendment, any community of any size would have to come up with 10 percent of any application or grant that they receive as a result of an application, is that right? Is that the way I understand it?

Mr. MARTINI. They would have to have a 10-percent matching provision for any grant that they would be eligible for under this program.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, is that a cash 10 percent, or is that in kind 10 percent, or what is it? What is that 10 percent?

Mr. MARTINI. It would be a matching 10-percent cash. That would be the intention of the amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. It would be in cash, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, not in kind?

Mr. MARTINI. Preferably in cash.

□ 1910

Mr. VOLKMER. I just wanted to clarify it so I would know.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTINI. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. The answer is it is a cash match. It is not an in-kind match in any way whatsoever.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, here we are again. After hearing that we were against block grants 4 months ago on the majority side, we are now enthusiastically for block grants.

All during the hearings and markup of this bill, you were against any matches in the Committee on the Judiciary, and now out of nowhere comes an amendment printed by the chairman of the subcommittee no less but offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, a 10-percent match.

Is there any rationale that we may employ to account for where this miraculous change of opinion has come about?

You have quite a few positions on these matters that seem to be changing the more we examine this bill.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The reason why is that we believed that we need to have a match in here. It is a better accountability proceeding.

Mr. CONYERS. So did we.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. We picked a 10-percent figure because after checking with the mayors, this seemed to be the reasonable amount. That amount would require the least discomfort, and a lot of the communities that could not afford larger matches would be able to afford this. We came up with a 10-percent figure, printed it in the RECORD, so it is not a big surprise to you. The task force of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] who worked with it on our side of the aisle is the one who has offered it today.

Mr. CONYERS. After hearing all your rhetoric against matching, I am glad that we at least have a point of agreement here. I guess that means that all of the discussion and debate against matching funds in the crime bill was not as important or valid as I thought you were making it.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. There may have been some Members who argued against matching on my side of the aisle but this one was not one of them. I argued against the fact that the police grant program, there was not nearly enough money out there because it cost \$60,000 a year instead of \$20,000 or \$25,000 to be able to put a police officer on the street. But I never argued against a match.

Mr. CONYERS. You do not recall yourself saying somewhere along the line that communities could not afford the police grants because there was a matching requirement?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. If the gentleman will yield, I have argued all along they could not afford it partly because of the 25-percent matching requirement and partly because and mainly because that the total cost of putting a new police officer on the streets instead of being the base number figured by the Department of Justice for a new police officer's salary at \$20,000 or \$25,000 was more like \$60,000 a year to get him out on the street. Plus the end of that program was down the road 3 years from then and the local communities had to pick up 100 percent of the grant program then. That is what I argued for.

Mr. CONYERS. That is why we have measures brought to the floor. We go through the committee hearings, we go through the markup, then we come to the floor and then you say, "Well, perhaps there is something to matches and we'll put one in.

So, look, this is a new position you have arrived at. I am happy about it. I have no objection to it. I just wanted to point out that I had not heard about it before, and it was printed in the RECORD and offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. So, so be it. I think it is an appropriate time to do it. We probably will not have any other chance to debate.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. I think this reflects two things. No. 1 is the compelling quality of your own persuasiveness in bringing these things forward. Second, is the good things that happen when we have an open rule. We are actually debating, we are listening.

This is an amendment that is brought to the floor, not least of which because there has been persuasion on both sides of the aisle. We have got better legislation as a result of it. I think we ought to all celebrate.

Mr. CONYERS. Would the gentleman need more time? I am happy to hear that. As a matter of fact, I was waiting for someone to realize that these were our arguments.

Mr. HOKE. We are very grateful.

Mr. CONYERS. Under those circumstances, I think that this is an amendment that we cannot resist.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] in a moment will speak to perhaps a different percentage, but I thought it would be interesting to discuss a little bit how we got to the 10-percent figure because we did start looking at higher numbers.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] has worked in local government and was very helpful in terms of working all this out. What we were trying to do basically was to get a threshold number that would make the local communities realize that they are buying into something. We have all seen the complete open-ended block grants for everybody—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. CASTLE and by unanimous consent, Mr. CONYERS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CONYERS. I continue to yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. We attempted to find a number in which the local communities would be involved but would not be such a high hurdle that they could not do it. And after a lot of discussions with a lot of local officials, we came out with a number of 10 percent. That is how we got to that number.

We feel it does exactly what you have talked about and we should bring the local communities into it and we get rid of the extraneous and perhaps unnecessary and unwarranted applications that might be made.

Mr. CONYERS. I am sorry you did not put my name on the amendment when you offered it. I did not realize how effective we had been.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] would be glad to add your name to the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. It is too late now.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Martini-Castle amendment. I think this bill must have some method of accountability in order to ensure that the grant money is not misused. A 10-percent match requirement would at least help ensure that local governments will have a financial interest in the success of the grant. Instead of local governments considering that grant money to be in effect free money, more care will be taken to ensure that the grants are not wasted. Oftentimes I think it can be shown that the degree of local concern will increase proportionately to the amount of matching grant.

Mostly I rise today, however, to tell my colleagues that I really thought a larger grant amount was appropriate. I have an amendment prepared to the amendment for a 20-percent grant, but in an abundance of caution and with some consultation with local officials and especially my colleagues, I am going to support the 10-percent matching grant requirement, insisting, as the gentleman from Delaware said, that it is a cash match.

My experience that leads me to the conclusion that we have to have a matching grant comes from serving on the State crime commission in the late 1960's and early 1970's when we had a number of excesses with the LEAA program. One of the excesses that came about, I think, related directly to the fact that we had no sufficient matching requirement.

In the existing crime bill, last year's bill that was enacted, there are matches that require 10 percent in some instances, in some cases as high as 40 percent. We have got some difficulty in local governments apparently with some of the higher matches. I think the 10-percent match is perhaps a bit minimal, but I believe that the will of the body would support a 10-percent amendment, and I am going to ask my colleagues to support on both sides of the aisle the initiative by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] and the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], and I want to associate myself with their effort and with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan in support of the matching requirement.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I want to thank very much the gentleman from Nebraska for his comments. It was partly because of his influence on me and discussing this over some time that we decided that a matching program was absolutely essential to accountability. I want to compliment him on coming out today just as I want to make sure on your time, I compliment appropriately the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] and the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] who have worked so well, one in local government, the other in a State capacity in the past who have seen the need for something of this nature.

We did work very, very hard to come up with a right number. Not everybody is in agreement on that number, but it is one which is acceptable to the vast majority of our cities and county government officials.

I thank the gentleman for acquiescing in the 10 percent. I appreciate his yielding. Like him, I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I would say that I appreciate the fact that the gentleman listened to some Members

on our side of the aisle and to the comments that we had in Republican conference on the need for a matching requirement. Our colleagues have taken the initiative. I urge my colleagues to support the Martini amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1920

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MFUME

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MFUME:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE II—DRUG COURTS

SEC. 201. DRUG COURTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating part V as part W;

(2) by redesignating section 2201 as section 2301; and

(3) by inserting after part U the following new part:

"PART V—DRUG COURTS

"SEC. 2201. GRANT AUTHORITY.

"The Attorney General may make grants to States, State courts, local courts, units of local government, and Indian tribal governments, acting directly or through agreements with other public or private entities, for programs that involve—

"(1) continuing judicial supervision over offenders with substance abuse problems who are not violent offenders; and

"(2) the integrated administration of other sanctions and services, which shall include—

"(A) mandatory periodic testing for the use of controlled substances or other addictive substances during any period of supervised release or probation for each participant;

"(B) substance abuse treatment for each participant;

"(C) diversion, probation, or other supervised release involving the possibility of prosecution, confinement, or incarceration based on noncompliance with program requirements or failure to show satisfactory progress; and

"(D) programmatic, offender management, and aftercare services such as relapse prevention, health care, education, vocational training, job placement, housing placement, and child care or other family support services for each participant who requires such services.

SEC. 2202. PROHIBITION OF PARTICIPATION BY VIOLENT OFFENDERS.

"The Attorney General shall—

"(1) issue regulations and guidelines to ensure that the programs authorized in this part do not permit participation by violent offenders; and

"(2) immediately suspend funding for any grant under this part, pending compliance, if the Attorney General finds that violent offenders are participating in any program funded under this part.

"SEC. 2203. DEFINITION.

"In this part, 'violent offender' means a person who—

"(1) is charged with or convicted of an offense, during the course of which offense or conduct—

"(A) the person carried, possessed, or used a firearm or dangerous weapon;

"(B) there occurred the death of or serious bodily injury to any person; or

"(C) there occurred the use of force against the person of another,

without regard to whether any of the circumstances described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) is an element of the offense or conduct of which or for which the person is charged or convicted; or

"(2) has one or more prior convictions for a felony crime of violence involving the use or attempted use of force against a person with the intent to cause death or serious bodily harm.

"SEC. 2204. ADMINISTRATION.

"(a) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and any other appropriate officials in carrying out this part.

"(b) USE OF COMPONENTS.—The Attorney General may utilize any component or components of the Department of Justice in carrying out this part.

"(c) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Attorney General may issue regulations and guidelines necessary to carry out this part.

"(d) APPLICATIONS.—In addition to any other requirements that may be specified by the Attorney General, an application for a grant under this part shall—

"(1) include a long-term strategy and detailed implementation plan;

"(2) explain the applicant's inability to fund the program adequately without Federal assistance;

"(3) certify that the Federal support provided will be used to supplement, and not supplant, State, Indian tribal, and local sources of funding that would otherwise be available;

"(4) identify related governmental or community initiatives which complement or will be coordinated with the proposal;

"(5) certify that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies and that there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies in the implementation of the program;

"(6) certify that participating offenders will be supervised by one or more designated judges with responsibility for the drug court program;

"(7) specify plans for obtaining necessary support and continuing the proposed program following the conclusion of Federal support; and

"(8) describe the methodology that will be used in evaluating the program.

"SEC. 2205. APPLICATIONS.

"To request funds under this part, the chief executive or chief justice of a State or the chief executive or chief judge of a unit of local government or Indian tribal government shall submit an application to the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

"SEC. 2206. FEDERAL SHARE.

"The Federal share of a grant made under this part may not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of the program described in the application submitted under section 2205 for the fiscal year for which the program receives assistance under this part, unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirement of a matching contribution under this section. In-kind contributions may constitute a portion of the non-Federal share of a grant.

"SEC. 2207. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.

"The Attorney General shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, an equitable geographic distribution of grant awards is made.

"SEC. 2208. REPORT.

"A State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government that receives funds under this part during a fiscal year shall submit to the Attorney General a report in March of the following year regarding the effectiveness of this part.

"SEC. 2209. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION.

"(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The Attorney General may provide technical assistance and training in furtherance of the purposes of this part.

"(b) EVALUATIONS.—In addition to any evaluation requirements that may be prescribed for grantees, the Attorney General may carry out or make arrangements for evaluations of programs that receive support under this part.

"(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The technical assistance, training, and evaluations authorized by this section may be carried out directly by the Attorney General, in collaboration with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or through grants, contracts, or other cooperative arrangements with other entities."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.), as amended by section 40231(b), is amended by striking the matter relating to part V and inserting the following:

"PART V—DRUG COURTS

"Sec. 2201. Grant authority.

"Sec. 2202. Prohibition of participation by violent offenders.

"Sec. 2203. Definition.

"Sec. 2204. Administration.

"Sec. 2205. Applications.

"Sec. 2206. Federal share.

"Sec. 2207. Geographic distribution.

"Sec. 2208. Report.

"Sec. 2209. Technical assistance, training, and evaluation.

"PART W—TRANSITION-EFFECTIVE DATE-REPEALER

"Sec. 2301. Continuation of rules, authorities, and proceedings."

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking "and U" and inserting "U, and V"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(20) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part V—

"(A) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1995;

"(B) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1996;

"(C) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1997;

"(D) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

"(E) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

"(F) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2000."

SEC. 202. STUDY BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall study and assess the effectiveness and impact of grants authorized by part V of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 as added by section 50001(a) and report to Congress the results of the study on or before January 1, 1997.

(b) DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION.—The Attorney General and grant recipients shall provide the Comptroller General with all relevant documents and information that the Comptroller General deems necessary to conduct the study under subsection (a), including the identities and criminal records of program participants.

(c) CRITERIA.—In assessing the effectiveness of the grants made under programs authorized by part V of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Comptroller General shall consider, among other things—

(1) recidivism rates of program participants;

(2) completion rates among program participants;

(3) drug use by program participants; and
(4) the costs of the program to the criminal justice system.

Mr. MCCOLLUM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly happy the distinguished gentleman from Florida has a concern because the amendment actually grew out of a program that found its genesis in Florida, and the distinguished Members of the Florida delegation I am sure will understand after I have an opportunity to discuss it, why it is so very important.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to H.R. 728, an amendment that would continue the Drug Court Program as enacted by the Violent Crime and Prevention Act of 1994. The Drug Court Program included in the list of programs targeted for elimination under H.R. 728 is an effective and valuable crime fighting tool, with the kind of proven results that Democrats, Republicans, and Independents want.

Although lumped, and I think lumped inadvertently with the prevention programs that this bill tends to eliminate, drug courts really are not a prevention program. Drugs courts would better be classified as an alternative punishment measure that has the indirect benefit of preventing crime.

Drug courts began as an innovative program by the State of Maryland. The gentlemen from Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. STEARNS, the other distinguished members of the Florida delegation I am sure can attest to the effectiveness of it in the State of Florida.

The State of Florida utilized a formula grant funding approach under the Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Act to fashion what eventually became an alternative punishment and drug rehabilitation program.

The program was very successful in providing first time drug offenders with a second chance. I am not talking about the hard core drug user, I am not talking about the weekend user. I am not even talking about the recreational user of drugs. I am talking about that first time drug offender, that young boy or that young girl who experiments with taking a drug and then gets caught.

In the city of Baltimore there are currently 130 people who have been diverted to the Drug Court Program and away from what conceivably could have been a life of crime, certainly a life of drug abuse.

Of almost 200 people that have been involved in the program since its in-

ception almost a year ago, only 10 of that 200 have dropped out. That means that out of every 20 nonviolent drug offenders who have been brought into the program in Baltimore, 19 out of that 20 has remained sober and clean, a surprisingly pleasant success rate.

The basic program includes intensive supervision of the participants by the court through drug testing and treatment and the prompt application of a graduated number of sanctions for failure to comply with the conditions of the program.

The program can be administered on a pretrial basis, it can be administered as a post-conviction program or it can be administered as both. That is up to the locale.

The Drug Court Program as we know it in various States has been so successful in reducing recidivism and providing drug offenders with an alternative to drug use that the crime bill that we have been talking about over and over again funded this as a separate entity in the 1994 act.

The cost of drug courts is about one-twentieth what it costs to put people in prison, and again let me point out that the recidivism rate is so very low that we end up cutting crime by 80 percent.

In my State of Maryland a unique consortium has been forged with representatives of the public defender's office, State's attorney's office, probation department, and treatment facilities work together to ensure adequate monitoring of treatment and supervision for the department.

Drug courts in Maryland provide drug treatment on demand and serve as an alternative to incarceration, again for first time drug offenders, thereby saving prison beds for the most violent of offenders in our society.

The program also provides job placement, it provides job counseling, it provides educational services and it even provides relapse prevention, in an effort to treat the problem and to provide intense supervision.

The drug courts programs that divert first time drug offenders from prison and then ultimately places them under strict court-enforced supervision is necessary and it is responsible. And as I said before, it is not Democratic, it is not Republican, it is not independent. It is the right thing to do and it is not something that we do not know about. The results are all over this society, and they have been shown to reduce recidivism rates and to return first time drug offenders to society as productive, law-abiding citizens.

Building more prisons does not necessarily do that. It may not be a bad idea but it does not do the same thing. So I would argue as we look at the first time drug offender that a young man or young woman or who for whatever reason experiments and gets caught, that we ought to make sure we do not do away with drug courts as we have known them and as they have worked so well.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida insist on his point of order?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not insist on my point of order. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it does appear that since the gentleman is adding back in drug courts from last year's crime bill as a separate drug courts title to this bill, and in essence undoing the repealer of the money for that in the program, that indeed this is a germane amendment. But what it does do is add \$1 billion in additional drug courts money and drug courts authorization to this bill, to the \$10 billion that underlies the bill, and adds it specifically to the purposes of drug courts. It goes against the grain of the very essence of what we are attempting to do in this bill even though many of us, including the people here, support the general precepts of drug courts.

What it does is to set forth a specific categorical grant program for drug courts to protect them, to make sure that indeed the monies that are set aside go to drug courts and not to anything else. Drug courts I might add again, it is additional money separate and apart from the \$10 billion that underlie this bill, so the way it is crafted, as I understand it, does not from my reading of it and my staff study of it, does not affect the underlying \$10 billion, it simply authorizes another billion for drug courts.

But the thrust of the principle of this still violates the concept that we on our side of the aisle want, and that is to send back to the local communities a decision on what they want to do with money that we provide them under this bill. We would like for the cities and the county commissions of each local community to make their own decision as to whether they want a drug court or not. We set up a supervisory panel and require one be set up for all the cities and counties that get money under this bill that include officers or some person representing the local courts. In addition, of course, there is a local prosecutor's representative, a local police or sheriff's department representative, a local school system representative and a local representative of a prevention program of some type in the community who presumably, and I would assume in most communities the way it works on lots of things, get together, talk over what is best for this community with the resources that they get under this bill; and then they will say, OK, look, if we have the idea for a drug court, and I know there are a lot of judges and law enforcement community members, district attorneys and so on who get together and like this idea, if we think this is good for our community, then

let us use a portion of our money to supplement or to create drug courts.

□ 1930

In some communities, drug courts are thriving right now without any Federal assistance. They got created without it. It would be nice to be able to help them. We would like to encourage them, but to suggest they work in every community is to suggest something I do not think is our duty to do, nor do I think it is the responsible thing to do.

There are plenty of places where it would work fine. There are lots of communities where it may not. I would suggest we should provide the resources here to let Spokane, WA, Sacramento, CA, Madison, WI, New Brunswick, GA, Orlando, FL, each of the communities wherever they are around the country decide for themselves if they want drug courts with this money and to use some of it to support it, not our setting it aside and saying, "Look, here is a certain amount of money. If you want that money, come get it, because we in Washington know what is best for you as a drug court. By golly, we want to get as many of these drug courts out there as possible."

I am not convinced every community ought to have a drug court. I am convinced they do work in a lot of communities. I would encourage them.

Our bill does do that. Our bill uses drug courts as a specific example of those kinds of things that we would list in order for local communities to look to for guidance of how they might use this money.

It is one of those that we have as sort of preferentially treated by that example, but everything in this underlying bill is including, but not limited to, so it allows local communities to decide yes or no or not at all.

And so I must oppose this amendment reluctantly, because I do like the concept of drug courts, reluctantly because I know the gentleman from Maryland has offered this with good intent, and reluctantly because I know how important it is to a lot of communities to have drug courts. But it destroys the underlying fabric and concept of the local community grant program that is in this bill, and I am opposed to it, and I do oppose this amendment and urge its defeat.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members, this is a measure that we should compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] for bringing to the crime bill.

The record is clear on this one. A study of 4,500 drug court participants between 1989 and 1993 showed that only 11 percent slipped back into criminal activity, which is a phenomenal accomplishment compared to the 60 percent recidivism rate for those who did not participate in the program.

Drug courts, which cost only \$800 a participant, compared to \$25,000 for incarceration, achieved these results through a tough court-supervised pro-

gram of counseling, drug testing, and daily monitoring. Those who do not comply know the alternative is incarceration, and so it is more than a prevention program. It is really almost an alternative form that is very effective, and with our prisons facing massive overcrowding that has been mentioned constantly here, these courts offer an effective alternative for steering non-violent first-time offenders away from crime toward a productive future as contributing members of society.

This is an important provision of last year's crime bill that I think many would welcome into the 1995 version.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me correct something that was said earlier by my colleague on the other side. This does not add new money. This simply takes the \$10 million that was already there for drug courts which has been taken out and puts it back in.

Let me get to the heart of this particular effort. We always say in this body that we want to look at those programs that work, and we want to eliminate those that do not. Well, in the State of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], he and the other distinguished Members of that delegation know this is where it found its genesis. It worked so well there it became a model for other States, including my State of Maryland.

You have got to remember this program is for the first-time drug offender, not the hard-core addict, not the weekend user, not the recreational user, but somebody's son or daughter who is in school, who might experiment with drugs and get caught. We put them in a program where 19 out of every 20 young people that go into it all have proven results. Recidivism rates are at an all-time low.

I dare say there is not another program that has that kind of a success record. So what we are saying here today is do we really want to, in all that we are doing, despite the partisanship on both sides, want to embrace a program that does what Democrats want, does what Republicans want, does what Americans want, independence; it creates the kind of results that make us feel proud and says to us in the process that we are able to go out and help young people before they go back and become the second-time offender, third-time offender, or the fourth-time offender and they have got a gun to your head or my head.

We are talking about somebody's son or daughter. I am not here to talk about pie in the sky. This is not an Mfume creation. This was born in Florida. The good people in Florida had the sense to embrace it and nourish it. It became so much of a national model in Maryland and elsewhere. It is working fantastically.

Might I say also that it is not mandatory. It says the Attorney General may make grants to the States, and so if a State does not want to participate, then it does not have to, but those grants go to specific things that deal with recidivism, with treatment, relapse prevention, and making sure we get young people away from drugs.

So I would just simply urge those who watch this debate and who are on the floor now to recognize that of all the things that we have come to embrace or to reject or to examine, that when it comes to drug courts, there is not another example that Democrats, Republicans, and independents can point to that has the kind of success in just the few short years that this has had.

I would urge all of my colleagues to find a way to allow themselves on this vote to go back and to restore the \$10 million that was taken out for this program. This is not the kind of prevention program that the bill intends to do away with. This is not really a prevention program.

The end direct result may be prevention. This is a program intended to help young people who are first-time offenders, and I would strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman. His explanation has been thorough and quite convincing.

The fact of the matter is that we have permitted this in the bill, and what we are doing is putting a money amount to it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just rise in support of the amendment and to reassert what my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], has said about the extraordinary success of this program.

I cannot sit here and fail to talk about something that I have had an opportunity to witness firsthand.

I know Judge Goldstein, who was the father of this program, and no later than just this week I received a letter from Judge Robert Fogan in Fort Lauderdale who presides in the drug court inviting me for the second time to speak to the graduates of the program and talking about the enormous successes that it has had.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are constantly about the business of trying to figure out some way to put somebody in jail. Rightly, criminals should be.

The serious question becomes: When we do have something that does work, should we not see to it that it is maintained?

I think that this program can be replicated throughout this Nation, and pretty obviously is one that all Members of this House ought to support.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. Could the gentleman again talk about the phenomenal success that the program experienced in Maryland? Actually it is phenomenal wherever it occurred. It began in that State.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. It did begin in Florida. The judge in Miami that originated the program is still presiding in it and has had hundreds of success stories.

What is remarkable is that they show a 90-percent success rate, and then in terms of recidivism, it increases. They have situations where as much as 95 percent of the graduates do not return to a life of crime.

Now, how best then can we work to try to help people? You know something else, too, my colleagues, most of these people who talk about crime have not been in a criminal courtroom, have not had to sentence somebody, have not had to stand with somebody that was sentenced. They have this notion that comes from this air-conditioned Capitol about what happens on the street.

These judges are in the trenches in Florida, and in Maryland and elsewhere in these drug courts, and they see these youngsters. They are not the hardened criminals, but they are the people that can become the hardened criminals.

Mr. MFUME. If the gentleman will yield, let me add also that of the 200 young people in Baltimore that entered the program, 190 never went back to drug use, never. They stayed away from crime and everything.

□ 1940

So again I would appeal to Members on both sides of the aisle to understand that we are trying to help someone by preventing a set of possibilities that nobody wants in this society. This is not for hard-time drug users, this is not for junkies out on the corner, this is not for crack and cocaine users, this is not for recreational users, for the weekend user; it is for the first-time drug offender, somebody's son or daughter in your district or mine who in school experiments with a drug and gets caught.

We have to find a way to make sure that this program that is so successful—every editorial, everything you read about it reeks success—that we not do away with it in our effort to try to reform this package.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], let the record clearly indicate that in the committee—and the gentleman from Michigan can speak to that and others in the Committee on the Judiciary—this issue was brought up at that time, and this issue was voted on at that time by the entire committee. Now, I am not one of those who has never been in a courtroom; I have been in many courtrooms in 38

years. I do have a feel for victims as well as people would have been arrested and are victims. I did offer up an amendment to the crime bill relative to drug courts, and it was at first unanimously adopted by both sides of the aisle.

Then there was an order to recommit and another vote taken, at which time it passed 20 to 15. It was not unanimous on that motion to recommit. Those folks on the other side of the aisle voted “no” to that motion to accept drug courts in the crime bill and those on this side of the aisle voted in the affirmative. That is how it made its way into the crime bill.

We are not insensitive. It was in inadvertently not given the standing in the crime bill that I thought it needed to have, and at that point we did pass it onto the floor.

So we are not unfamiliar with courtrooms and with this issue.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEINEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for refreshing the memories of the members on the committee and the Members in the House because he is absolutely correct. I am hoping that the gentleman from Maryland has persuasively convinced him now to take the next step to create not only the permissive use that was accepted on the gentleman's own amendment, which was convincingly put to the Committee on the Judiciary, but that we carve out this modest sum of money to create an authorization for the same program that the gentleman in his career of police work has so long enforced.

Mr. HEINEMAN. I thank the gentleman.

I think what we are really talking about is what separates the philosophy on both sides of the aisle, on letting that be a grant whereby it is voluntary on the parts of those folks at the local level to use it as they see fit. And the gentleman from Maryland is putting a dollar figure on it.

Mr. CONYERS. If the gentleman would yield further, we persuaded the gentleman about block grants, we persuaded him about matching funds, and now we have to convince him of the wisdom of moving in support of the drug courts from a permissive use to an authorization. It is a small step.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would point out that the gentleman is correct. I was a member of the majority that voted to put the gentleman's language into the bill to make it perfectly clear that drug courts are an important part of this legislation, and the funding is available. In fact, any community that wants to use all of the funding made available to that community for drug courts can do so under

their bill, and, in fact, we have almost \$2 billion per year made available so conceivably, if drug courts are the preference of each locality in the country, all of the money could be spent on drug courts.

I think they are a fine program. Some of the localities in my district are starting them and want to have this money available. Other communities in my district do not feel they need drug courts, and I think, as a result, we should make it plain that this program does have it available, the bill does that, but it does not sequester any funds in this program for any specific program.

I think if we are going to give the localities the flexibility to handle fighting crime at the local level in the manner they see best fit, we should leave the bill as it is with the specific language allowing drug courts, but nothing more.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEINEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

Of course, the gentleman understands the difference between leaving this in a block grant where it competes against an infinite number of others; the question is whether he feels convinced of the importance of this so as to lift it out of this infinite multitude of permissible items in the block grant to give it a life of its own. It would still, I say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE], still be optional; it would still not be mandatory to anybody. But it would be rewarding a program that works. And that to me is the important comments that were made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] that make it so important that we pass this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I just want to indicate that in a conversation with the head of our Office of Drug Policy just a couple of days ago, it was very clear that the utilization or the usage of drugs is now increasing. So I rise to support the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], his very succinct request, very frank and honest request, that not only do we applaud the fact that we use allocated dollars for drug courts but we isolate the language in the legislation and it is specific.

I simply want to say we have a drug problem in this country, the gentleman has highlighted the problem; I think it is one that should be addressed as it relates to first-time offenders.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say directly to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN] that I am heartened to hear his remarks. The fact that he tried in committee to do essentially the same thing is commendable, and I appreciate his courage in this effort here tonight, which was not successful and maybe because someone on my side of the aisle did not join with him.

Let me just say, though, that no one in this body has a license on purity on either side of the aisle. I would strongly say to the gentleman that I can empathize with his agony over having lost on something like that, and that is why I am so tremendously bent on trying to provide it myself.

Well, the gentleman won, but he did not make it this far. That is why we are trying to win again with it.

Let me just say one thing about block grants, which is important. If we are talking about block granting a basketball program that is one thing. That is an easy thing to do. Or block granting something else, it may be easy to do.

Drug courts are very specific. My fear is, if we do that, that what you will have is a drug court type A in this State, B in this State, and C in this. It will not be the same thing. It will not produce the same results, because there are no guidelines mandated in this instance that the Attorney General would carry out.

For instance, it says these courts shall provide mandatory periodic testing for the young person, first-time offender, for the use of controlled substances or other addictive substances, but substance abuse for each participant would be measured. There would be diversion, probation, and supervised training, and even the possibility of prosecution and confinement or incarceration, based on noncompliance with program requirements or, for that matter, failing to show satisfactory progress.

It goes on further: Programmatic, offender management, and after-care services, such as relapse prevention, would be there, that the Attorney General would issue further guidelines. You are not going to get that in block grant. What you are going to get with the States who are saying: "Oh, drug courts, they work, let's go try one." That will not be the same thing.

So, since we have a program that works, and again I challenge Members of this body, anyone, to show me any program that works as well as this Nation in terms of recidivism rates, keeping them down, and success rates in helping the first-time young person who is abusing drugs. To say if you will just embrace this language, let us put back the money for drugs courts that we have taken out and do the right thing so that somebody's son or daughter whom we represent, whom they love, will not be in a position of believing that the Congress had an opportunity to act but did not.

□ 1950

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina won. It is here establishing or supporting drug courts in law enforcement block grants. I say to the gentleman, "What we want to do, sir, is promote you. You have done a great job. You deserve this. And what you're doing is isolating this out, putting a lot more language around it."

Remember, this is not a raw experiment any more. It is proven. Attorney General Reno tried it in Florida. Judges tried it in Florida. In Maryland it is working. I want to get this into Michigan.

So, what we are trying to say in our own stumbling way is, "You did great. You have done well. Please accept our promotion on this side of the aisle."

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, "Thank you. You did it as well tonight as you did it in committee; I have to say that."

But, for the gentleman from Maryland, I believe that language that he read as it relates to the punishment and the sanctions are getting off track as it relates to the drug court sanctions within the language of the bill as it related to what came out of committee.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks by saying that drug usage is increasing. We need to do this in a bipartisan way and to respond to the needs of all of our States. I think effective drug courts will be part of the solution and not part of the problem.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I will not use the 5 minutes in full.

Mr. Chairman, the only point that I want to make is I think we all agree here that drug courts can be very effective. In my community, the city of Cincinnati in Hamilton County, we are just getting under way with the drug court. I fully support the drug court. I supported the gentleman from North Carolina's proposal that we make, clearly in the language in this bill, the drug courts, the money can be used for drug courts; we all agree on that. Where we differ is that the gentleman from Maryland would like to put another billion dollars of tax dollars to be spent.

If we are going to actually move toward a balanced budget amendment, we have to be very careful, and for that reason I oppose an additional billion dollars.

I also think that we should not earmark for particular programs. I think the local communities know best what works in those communities.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to give the flexibility to the local governments to decide how to spend those dollars, whether it is police officers, additional police officers, whether it is drug courts or whatever. Let us leave it up to the localities. I think they know better than the Federal Government does.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be as concise as possible. The National Justice Institute, which was the subject of some of the discussion earlier, did a study a number of years ago where they sought to identify the correlation between crime, street crime, and drug use and found that in some of our Nation's largest cities that upward of 90 percent of the street crime over the course of their analysis was drug-driven. I think we all understand how the problem of drugs drives up some of the crime issues that we are trying to get at in this legislation and that there is no debate on either side of the aisle about the effectiveness of drug courts, and I would not want us to miss the opportunity.

I served on a panel appointed by our State court, along with the bar association, the defenders and others in Pennsylvania, to look at this issue and to move forward on drug court as an alternative to how we have been proceeding. Given the concern that the previous gentleman spoke about in terms of a balanced budget, if we look at the costs of prison construction, law enforcement, we can see that on the prevention side drug courts could actually save us money, and the only thing that I would hasten to add, as I conclude, is that one of the points we have to understand as a body is that on the issue of crime we do not want to have to create a circumstance in which one needs a victim in order for us to do anything, and if we work on the prevention side, we alleviate a great deal of pain, not just for the first-time drug offender, but for all of the victims of what could become a hardened drug user.

So, I would ask the house to sincerely and favorably consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 266, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No 121]

AYES—160

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Berman
Ackerman	Beilenson	Bishop
Barcia	Bentsen	Bonior

Borski	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy	Kelly	Myrick	Shuster
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall	Kim	Nethercutt	Sisisky
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Rangel	King	Neumann	Skeen
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Reed	Kingston	Ney	Smith (MI)
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Reynolds	Klug	Norwood	Smith (NJ)
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson	Knollenberg	Nussle	Smith (TX)
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers	Kolbe	Orton	Smith (WA)
Clayton	Kennelly	Roemer	LaHood	Oxley	Solomon
Clement	Kildee	Rose	Largent	Packard	Souder
Clyburn	Kiecicka	Roybal-Allard	Latham	Parker	Spence
Coleman	Klink	Rush	LaTourette	Paxon	Stearns
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Sabo	Laughlin	Payne (VA)	Stenholm
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Sanders	Lazio	Peterson (MN)	Stockman
Conyers	Levin	Sawyer	Leach	Petri	Stump
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Schroeder	Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Talent
Danner	Lofgren	Schumer	Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Tanner
de la Garza	Lowey	Scott	Lightfoot	Porter	Tate
DeFazio	Luther	Serrano	Lincoln	Portman	Tauzin
DeLauro	Maloney	Shays	Linder	Poshard	Taylor (MS)
Dellums	Manton	Skaggs	Lipinski	Pryce	Taylor (NC)
Deutsch	Markey	Skelton	Livingston	Quillen	Thomas
Dicks	Martinez	Slaughter	LoBiondo	Quinn	Thornberry
Dingell	Mascara	Spratt	Longley	Radanovich	Tiahrt
Dixon	McCarthy	Stark	Lucas	Ramstad	Torkildsen
Doggett	McDermott	Stokes	Manzullo	Regula	Upton
Dooley	McHale	Studds	Martini	Riggs	Vucanovich
Doyle	McKinney	Stupak	McCollum	Roberts	Waldholtz
Durbin	McNulty	Tejeda	McCrery	Rogers	Walker
Engel	Meehan	Thompson	McDade	Rohrabacher	Walsh
Eshoo	Meek	Thornton	McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
Evans	Menendez	Thurman	McInnis	Roth	Watts (OK)
Farr	Mfume	Torres	McIntosh	Roukema	Weldon (FL)
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Torricelli	McKeon	Royce	Weldon (PA)
Fazio	Mineta	Towns	Metcalfe	Salmon	Weller
Fields (LA)	Mink	Trafficant	Meyers	Sanford	White
Filner	Moakley	Velazquez	Mica	Saxton	Whitfield
Flake	Mollohan	Vento	Miller (FL)	Scarborough	Wicker
Foglietta	Moran	Visclosky	Minge	Schaefer	Wolf
Ford	Murtha	Volkmer	Molinari	Schiff	Young (AK)
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Ward	Montgomery	Seastrand	Young (FL)
Frost	Neal	Waters	Moorhead	Sensenbrenner	Zeliff
Furse	Oberstar	Watt (NC)	Morella	Shadegg	Zimmer
Gejdenson	Obey	Waxman	Myers	Shaw	
Gephardt	Olver	Wilson			
Gonzalez	Ortiz	Wise			
Gutierrez	Owens	Woolsey			
Hamilton	Pallone	Wyden	Becerra	Gibbons	Tucker
Hastings (FL)	Pastor	Wynn	Chapman	Jefferson	Williams
Hilliard	Payne (NJ)	Yates	Crapo	Matsui	
Hinchey	Pelosi				
Hoyer	Peterson (FL)				

NOT VOTING—8

□ 2012

Mr. PETERSON of Florida and Mr. RICHARDSON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHABOT: Page 18, after line 22, insert the following:

“(9) RESOLUTION OF DISPARATE ALLOCATIONS.—(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if—

“(i) the attorney general of a State certifies that a unit of local government under the jurisdiction of the State bears more than 50 percent of the costs of prosecution or incarceration that arise with respect to part 1 violent crimes reported by a specified geographically constituent unit of local government, and

(ii) but for this paragraph, the amount of funds allocated under this section to—

“(I) any one such specified geographically constituent unit of local government exceeds 200 percent of the amount allocated to the unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i), or

“(II) more than one such specified geographically constituent unit of local government (excluding units of local government referred to subclause I and in paragraph (7)), exceeds 400 percent of the amount allocated to the unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i) and the attorney general of the State determines that such allocation

is likely to threaten the efficient administration of justice,

then in order to qualify for payment under this title, the unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i), together with any such specified geographically constituent units of local government described in clause (ii), shall submit to the Director a joint application for the aggregate of funds allocated to such units of local government. Such application shall specify the amount of such funds that are to be distributed to each of the units of local government and the purposes for which such funds are to be used. The units of local government involved may establish a joint local advisory board for the purposes of carrying out this paragraph.

(B) In this paragraph, the term “geographically constituent unit of local government” means a unit of local government that has jurisdiction over areas located within the boundaries of an area over which a unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i) has jurisdiction.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of bipartisanship and cooperation, this amendment is also offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN], who will also address the House.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses a concern raised in our Committee on the Judiciary markup, and I have been working with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN]. Many counties are responsible for administering the criminal justice system for all the other jurisdictions within their territory. They bear the costs of pretrial detention. They provide the county jails. They pay the prosecutors and the public defenders. And they are responsible for maintaining the courts and paying for the judges.

Clearly, arrests made by jurisdictions within these counties have significant implications for county budgets. What this amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is say that where the attorney general of a State, in his discretion, sees fit to certify that a county bears the bulk of prosecution or incarceration costs associated with violent crimes committed in a city within that county, and where the formula in this bill, nonetheless, allocates to one city government at least twice as much of the grant money, then the city and the county have to get together and agree on the ways that their combined grant money should be spent.

The same situation would obtain where a number of cities within a county added together would be eligible for a total grant amount exceeding 400 percent of what the county would get. If the state attorney general determines that such a situation threatens the efficient administration of justice, then the cities and the counties would be required to work together.

We do not change the allocation formula at all. But we do require that cities and counties work together when the allocation formula creates a real anomaly, which has occurred in a number of instances.

These allocation anomalies can arise, Mr. Chairman, because while the bill

NOES—266

Allard	Clinger	Gekas
Andrews	Coble	Geren
Archer	Coburn	Gilchrist
Armey	Collins (GA)	Gillmor
Bachus	Combest	Gilman
Baesler	Condit	Goodlatte
Baker (CA)	Cooley	Goodling
Baker (LA)	Costello	Gordon
Baldacci	Cox	Goss
Ballenger	Cramer	Graham
Barr	Crane	Green
Barrett (NE)	Cremeans	Greenwood
Bartlett	Cubin	Gunderson
Barton	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Bass	Davis	Hall (OH)
Bateman	Deal	Hall (TX)
Bereuter	DeLay	Hancock
Bevill	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Bilbray	Dickey	Harman
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Hastert
Bliley	Dornan	Hastings (WA)
Blute	Dreier	Hayes
Boehlert	Duncan	Hayworth
Boehner	Dunn	Hefley
Bonilla	Edwards	Hefner
Bono	Ehlers	Heineman
Boucher	Ehrlich	Herger
Brewster	Emerson	Hilleary
Browder	English	Hobson
Brownback	Ensign	Hoekstra
Bryant (TN)	Everett	Hoke
Bunn	Ewing	Holden
Bunning	Fawell	Horn
Burr	Fields (TX)	Hostettler
Burton	Flanagan	Houghton
Buyer	Foley	Hunter
Callahan	Forbes	Hutchinson
Calvert	Fowler	Hyde
Camp	Fox	Inglis
Canady	Franks (CT)	Istook
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Jacobs
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (CT)
Chambliss	Frisa	Johnson (SD)
Chenoweth	Funderburk	Johnson, Sam
Christensen	Galleghy	Jones
Chrysler	Ganske	Kasich

quite properly allocates money largely on the basis of part 1 violent crimes occurring within the different jurisdictions, some regions of the country report at the county level crimes that in other regions are reported at the city level.

Thus, in some states, such as in Florida, the allocations between counties and cities appear roughly proportionate. Whereas in other states, such as my State, Ohio, there are some significant disparities between the jurisdictions that make the arrests and the jurisdictions that administer the justice after the arrests are made.

Where such disparities occur, the common sense solution is that the affected cities and counties work together to ensure that proper coordination occurs.

This amendment provides that cities and counties in this situation will apply jointly for the sums of money allocated them under the bill. And to that end, the amendment permits them to establish a joint local advisory board in satisfaction of the requirements of the bill.

In keeping with the guiding principle of this legislation, we do not tell these localities how they must coordinate their efforts. We leave them to do that, and each affected area may establish such mechanisms and policies as their local officials see.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this amendment leaves the bill's allocation formula in place and does not affect the amount of grant monies that will go to any given state. It only applies to require county-city coordination when, first, the county pays the majority of the costs associated with prosecution or incarceration, and, second, the city, on the basis of these crimes, is allocated at least 200 percent of the amount allocated to the county or a group of cities allocates 400 percent of what their county allocates.

I understand that this amendment has support of the chairman of the subcommittee, who along with the chairman of the subcommittee has done such an outstanding job working, quite frankly, night and day to get this legislation passed, to allow us to consider the criminal law reforms we have taken up over the last week.

I urge its adoption, and I understand at this point that it does have bipartisan support, that both the leadership on our side of the aisle and also the leadership on the other side of the aisle is in agreement.

□ 2020

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I have made no secret that I have philosophical problems with this bill overall. I did not agree with taking the \$2.5 billion out of the local grant program and putting it in prisons. I think we ought to do a minimum setaside for prevention programs. Those are philosophical disputes that I have.

Nevertheless, to the extent that this bill passes, I think it is very important that this be a workable bill. I very much enjoyed working with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] to make sure this does work well.

The issue that is really pertinent is when a city or cities gets a very large amount of money and the county gets comparatively less, the administration of justice will be defeated. We all know that it is important to arrest people who have committed crimes and who threaten our neighborhoods, but if the funds are not available to prosecute those individuals and to move forward in the process, ultimately the act of arresting somebody is not good enough.

We need to make sure that the entire system works, from arrest to prosecution to local incarceration, and ultimately, to prison, if that is the end result of the prosecution and conviction.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this remedy outlined by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] and myself I believe will resolve this issue. I do not think it is controversial. It has been devised on a bipartisan basis, and I would recommend it to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been advised that the pending amendment was not printed in the RECORD.

Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is considered as having been read.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the more I briefly examine this amendment, the more difficulty I have with it, because it is not clear. Even though we like cities and counties to work together, I began thinking about how in the real world this is going to happen, I mean by us putting an amendment of this kind in.

It seems to me that in areas where a city has a large allocation of funds coming by virtue of the fact that there is activity that requires more funding under this bill, and the county has less, forcing the city and county together is going to operate to the detriment of the city.

It may be, I would say to the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN], who herself is a former county official, better to let them work these differences out themselves, because it is not clear what we are ordering them to do in the amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, to give us a little more detail about the language contained.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me preface my remarks by saying that I spent half of my political career prior to being here in Congress as a city official, being a Cincinnati city council-

man. I spent the other half being a county commissioner, so I have seen both sides.

What we have done in this bill, working with the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN], is to come up with a formula here which sets out what we felt was a fair and equitable way for the parties to come up with a reasonable solution.

We are not dictating to those jurisdictions what the exact formula should be. We are saying they should get together and work it out among themselves, if they come up with a situation where there is really an anomaly.

Mr. CONYERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, are they not going to work it out anyway? I mean, if the gentleman is not giving them any specific direction, if this is just a hortatory couple of paragraphs, no problem.

If there is nothing specific driving them into an agreement, Mr. Chairman, then I feel less reluctant about it.

However, Mr. Chairman, what is it we are doing? Are we inviting them to cooperate?

Mr. CHABOT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, the thing that will drive them to cooperate is they would not get the money if they did not cooperate, so they would be receiving Federal dollars here for law enforcement that would benefit both the city and the county.

It would be up to the city and the county to work together to come up with an agreement, because otherwise, Mr. Chairman, neither would get the money, so it is definitely to their advantage to come up with an agreement. We do not want to dictate exactly what that agreement needs to be, but it is in both of their interests.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, which entity would not get the money if they did not agree? Would they not all be eligible for a certain amount of money anyway?

Mr. CHABOT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, neither.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Very briefly, although in a sense this is analogous to the plan in last year's bill that provides for a comprehensive plan as a condition precedent to receive the funds, but only in the limited circumstance where a city gets a disproportionate amount of money compared to a county, the intent is for those two entities to work it out as they would have in last year's crime bill, in a comprehensive plan, to make sure that the system works. I will give the gentleman an example.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that under this formula, Chicago would get in the neighborhood of \$60 million, and Cook County would get \$700,000. Cook

County is not going to be able to prosecute all the people that Chicago arrests unless they get together and figure out what they are going to do as a unit, so that is in the city's interest, it is in the county's interest, it is in the citizens' interests, and I think the precedent was really set last year.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I was listening to this and I was curious about what the gentleman just said, Mr. Chairman. If we have a county in which we have a major city that is predominant in the county, and what this amendment, the way I am understanding this, listening to it, is, if that city is not able to persuade the county to work with them and make an application, nobody gets any money.

What it means to me, Mr. Chairman, is that the county can say "OK, we want half the money, we get half, or we are not going to get any." Now wait a minute, Mr. Chairman. Is that really what the members want to do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONYERS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, at first when I heard that everybody was in harmony about this amendment and everything, I was not paying much attention, but as I listened and listened I got more concerned about it all along.

That concerns me, to where I know not every city and county government get along; that not every city within a county and that county government get along. It is not like everybody is really happy with what is going on.

As a result of this, Mr. Chairman, what I am afraid may happen is that we are going to find local jurisdictions fighting with each other as to how much money they are going to get out of the total application.

To be honest with the Members, I will tell the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, I really do not care about this amendment, and I do not care about the bill, anyway. But I am afraid if it did become law that it is really going to bring strife out there more than anything else. I have serious concerns, also.

I would just say this, Mr. Chairman. What we are doing here is putting the political subdivision that has a large area, a large population and small eligibility into the driver's seat in terms of an accord being worked out at the peril of municipality not receiving anything. That, I think, would be a position we would not want to write into the bill, because it would put every city, particularly every major city, at a horrendous disadvantage.

Mr. Chairman, if we did not have the provision in, I think that agreement would have to come about anyway, but it might come about on parts where the county would not be involved.

□ 2030

After all, we have been working on crime grants, block grants, direct grants all along and we have been doing it without the sense that is implied in this particular amendment.

What I am saying is that at best I would like my two friends to withdraw this amendment, so that overnight we can give it a little bit more support, or else I would probably have to oppose it at this point.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak very much in support of this essential amendment. There is an anomaly where you have a high crime rate city that is within the confines of a county and a shared responsibility for the administration of justice. Cook County is a perfect example, where the city of Chicago under the formula in the bill gets some \$30 million, as I understand it, and that is because the crime rate in Chicago is high. However, the housing of the prisoners, the prosecution of the prisoners and all that administration costs belongs to Cook County. So Cook County gets \$200,000 and the city of Chicago gets \$30 million. Now, justice is served if both Cook County, and I might add the administration of Cook County and the administration of Chicago are very friendly, if both the county and the city apply together and the State attorney general determines that this anomaly exists so there is that protection, then the money is more evenly distributed and appropriately distributed as agreed to between the parties.

So this recognizes an anomaly. It is an effort to establish some equity and balance. This situation in Chicago and Cook County obtains in many other places around the country. Frankly, it just makes a more equitable, fair distribution of these essential funds.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman very articulately spelled out the reasons why this amendment is important.

To use another example, in my community, the city of Cincinnati, when the city police officers make arrests, the criminals are basically then turned over to the county. The county prosecutes them, there are county judges and they are incarcerated at county expenses. So what we want to occur is some fairness and reasonableness, and for the city and the county to work together, and I think they will. I think the counties and the cities all across this country are very reasonable and will do that.

Mr. HYDE. The State attorney general makes that determination of this anomalous situation.

Mr. CHABOT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HYDE. This is an important amendment, it is not really that controversial, and I hope we will all support it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Ohio. Both of these Members of the House are members of the Committee on the Judiciary and brought up at the earliest possible moment the fact that defining any formula for allocation of grants can be difficult, and in particular, the bill selects the part 1 violent crimes as determined by the FBI as the method to makes grants to various localities.

Using part 1 violent crimes, again as defined by the FBI, is probably the best overall way that anyone can come up with for such an allocation, but it is by no means perfect, and it may omit certain kinds of situations, in particular the one that is being addressed in this amendment right now where the higher number of crimes are in one jurisdiction and, therefore, the criminal activity is there and presumably the police department or sheriff's department is most active there, but another unit of government has responsibilities for those criminal cases generated by arrests that might occur, either housing in a county jail before trial or prosecuting the cases.

I think that while no formula is perfect, the amendment being offered here jointly is a very good attempt to solve a portion of the problem that exists in using part 1 as the system for awarding grants.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Just briefly, frankly I would have preferred that in every case localities would have to get together and put together a comprehensive plan in order to get any money. But that is not what this amendment does. It is a very narrow amendment that I actually wish would go further, that basically says when the city gets more than 200 percent of what the county has, you are going to have a problem. If those cities utilize that for police, the administration of justice will be impaired. In the case of smaller cities, it would be 400 percent. So I think this is targeted to a problem.

Perhaps it is not the perfect solution, but it is the solution we were able to come up with. It is only when the counties bear the cost of prosecution and incarceration. So I still think it resolves a problem that will be created by the bill absent this or something like this, because in the end both the cities, the counties and the citizens

want the bad guys to be arrested and then prosecuted, and unless we have something like this, the prosecution then may suffer.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had a sufficient discussion on the issue. I wanted to flag this problem. I am going to see if it is tracked in the old crime bill. I want to make it clear that this may come back up in conference. I withdraw any of my own personal feelings about it, but let me remind you, relations are not as harmonious as they are reported to be in Cook County and Chicago between the city and the county. I am delighted to hear how well the local governments work together. Unfortunately, I know better across the Nation that there are a lot of places where that is not the case. Also remember, please, that Chicago is not getting the money because they are Chicago. They are getting the money because that is where the crime is. That is where the problem is. The county does have to lock them up and have some prosecutorial responsibility, but Chicago is getting the bulk of the money because the way we have derived the formulas, they are entitled to it.

So I want everyone to know that, stay tuned on this. I will withdraw my reluctance about this amendment, because we have one more we would like to get through tonight before we conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONYERS: Page 4, after line 19, insert the following:

“(G) Establishing the programs described in the following subtitles of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (as such title and the amendments made by such title were in effect on the day preceding the date of the enactment of this Act):

“(i) Ounce of Prevention Council under subtitle A.

“(ii) Local Crime Prevention Block Grant Program under subtitle B.

“(iii) Model Intensive Grant Program under subtitle C.

“(iv) Family and Community Endeavor Schools Grant Program under subtitle D.

“(v) Assistance for Delinquent and At-Risk Youth under subtitle G.

“(vi) Police Retirement under subtitle H.

“(vii) Local Partnership Act under subtitle J which made amendments to chapter 67 to title 31, United States Code.

“(viii) National Community Economic Partnership under subtitle K.

“(ix) Urban Recreation and At-Risk Youth subtitle O which made amendments to the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978.

“(x) Community-Based Justice Grants under subtitle Q.

“(xi) Family Unity Demonstration Project under subtitle S.

“(xii) Gang Resistance and Education Training under subtitle X”.

Page 9, after line 8, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subsections accordingly):

“(c) SET-ASIDE FOR PREVENTION.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall allocate \$1,000,000,000 of such funds for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000 to carry out the purposes of subparagraph (G) of section 101(a)(2).

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for one moment to just read the amendment since it was not printed and we were just handed a copy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

□ 2040

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, because of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 15 minutes on this amendment, for and against.

The CHAIRMAN. On this amendment and any amendments to this amendment?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman consider 10 and 10, as it is 20 minutes to 9 at the present time?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this amendment is pretty large.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the gentleman from Michigan's request to 15 and 15.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 15 minutes in support of his amendment, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] will be recognized for 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely sets aside \$5 billion in a separate block grant for the prevention programs formerly authorized in the 1949 crime bill but does not specify funding levels for each program. Local governments can choose which program is best for them.

Only 20 percent of last year's crime bill, that is \$6 billion of the \$30 billion

total went for prevention programs. But the new majority cut \$2½ billion here in favor of more prisons.

So what we are doing is creating a prevention program worth \$5 billion in a separate block grant restoring each and every one of those that were struck in the 1994 crime bill.

This is a more cost effective approach because the prevention programs are essential to dealing with crime on the front end of the problem, nourishing the health growth of communities, and study after study shows that this dose of prevention will now avoid the most costly police courts and prisons that later come on.

Let us look at the data of just a few of them. The drug treatment program: A July 1994 study of the cost of treating 150,000 participants in drug treatment programs in California found benefits in a ratio of \$7 in benefits for every \$1 spent. Criminal activity declined by two-thirds, alcohol and drug use by two-fifths and health care costs by one-third. Recreational programs in Phoenix, AZ, crime was cut in half by keeping recreation centers open until 2 a.m. In Fort Myers, FL, juvenile arrests dropped 28 percent when the city built a new recreational center in a low-income area.

The costs of these programs is often as low as an amazing 60 cents per participant. President Bush selected one of the programs, midnight basketball in College Park, MD for one of the 1,000 Points of Light Program.

Gang intervention programs in Spokane, WA helped steer juveniles away from gangs while offering constructive alternatives.

The list goes on and on, but we want to eliminate once and for all the simplistic notion that all prevention programs are wasteful. We repeal them in favor of a no-strings block grant that we think will effectively reach some accommodation between the 1994 crime bill and the 1995 proposal that is before us in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico withdraw his reservation on the point of order?

Mr. SCHIFF. I do withdraw my reservation, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment by the gentleman from Michigan, and the reason is not the sincerity of the gentleman from Michigan wishing to promote the fight against crime as he best sees it, but because I believe this amendment goes against the very nature of the purpose of H.R. 728.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, with the utmost respect, that those who do not agree with the philosophy of those of us who are advancing H.R. 728

should, when the time comes, simply vote against it, but not to change H.R. 728 in a way that changes its fundamental approach.

I believe that the gentleman's amendment makes those changes in two separate ways. The first change is the gentleman's amendment does more than simply reserve funds specifically for prevention programs as a general concept. The gentleman's amendment preserves certain programs that are found in the crime bill that passed in 1994, as I read his amendment word for word, as they appear in the crime bill of 1994.

One of the problems with that crime bill is after many programs there is page after page after page of restrictions and conditions, not simply illustrations but actually Washington dictating how the programs have to function.

This was somewhat lessened as we considered the crime bill twice last year, but I believe it is still present, and the idea of copying in H.R. 728 with all of the restrictive language and then micromanagement from the Congress and Justice Department is against the very grain of H.R. 728.

Second of all, Mr. Chairman, I have to acknowledge that even if that problem were not there, even if this were an amendment that simply said let us set aside a certain amount of funds for prevention programs and did not otherwise specify the prevention programs, and that is not what this amendment says, but even if it did, I would oppose it because, again, the philosophy we are advancing in H.R. 728 is to let communities decide what they need best for their communities.

It may well be that some communities feel the need to use all of their funds or almost all of their funds for more police officers, and that is fine with us. It may be that some communities decide that they must use all of their funds or almost all of their funds for prevention programs. That is also fine with us. And we believe that setting aside amounts for certain purposes that take away that flexibility from local governments is contrary, even without the other specifications, by copying word for word prevention from the crime bill into this amendment is a mistake and, therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, No. 1, these programs are all grant programs that are utterly voluntary. Nobody has to choose them. They are not mandated into them. They are optional programs. They are programs that, incidentally, the Congress, including the Senate, the other body, agreed to in last year's law. So these are not new programs, and that is why if they sound familiar to the gentleman, they are.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan not only for yielding me the time but also for his leadership on this important prevention issue.

Let me say, ladies and gentlemen, that I feel that we do have to have a broad and comprehensive approach to this bill. We need tough punishment, and I supported more funding for prisons, and we need more cops on the beat, and we may have an amendment tomorrow on that.

But we also need prevention funds because we do not want to be in a situation in our society where we incarcerate and incarcerate and incarcerate, as we sadly must, when there are violent criminals and there is no hope.

If Members believe there is no hope at all, or if they believe Government should play no role in bringing hope so that young men and young women who are 12 and 13 and 14 are inevitably going to be criminals, then vote against this amendment.

But I do not think most people believe that. I think most people believe, yes, there are a few who are so damaged that they will become criminals no matter what we do. But there are many who have not been given the opportunities and the parenting and everything else, who, if a reaching hand could come out through a mentoring program or through a drug treatment program or through even a place where they get to congregate and play in a constructive way, that many might be turned.

□ 2050

The cost of these programs per individual is a heck of a lot cheaper than incarcerating them. Now, that should not be an excuse that we should not incarcerate. We must.

But there is no reason why we should not do both, and I would say to my colleagues I have seen program after program that works.

Drug courts take tens of thousands of young men and get them off the life of drugs before they become hardened criminals, mentoring programs where an adult, the only adult in these young people's lives, oftentimes spends an hour a day with an individual and sets him or her straight, sets the person straight.

In Roosevelt, LI, they have a program where every junior high school and high school student, and it is a very poor area, spends 1 hour a day with an adult, and the dropout rate plunged. The criminal rate plunged.

I would say to my colleagues there are prevention programs that work, that we have seen them, tested time and time again.

One of the lowest points in my public life was when every program was branded as pork because it did not go to the right people or the right district or sounded the right way. This is not an issue of not punishing. This is not an

either-or situation. This is for many people in this country and for many communities and many neighborhoods the only hope that there is. We should not turn away from it.

And so I would urge my colleagues in all sincerity to look at this provision and to try and pass it. Every program in this bill has model after model that has worked and saved the lives of the young.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I think that this vote on this amendment is the most important vote that we have faced this year.

You know, I have two small children. They go to a little inner-city elementary school, and none of the reasons why I ran for Congress was to make a difference in what they are facing and what their classmates are facing.

A watershed moment for me was a year ago October when I took my third-grader to school and they had found a dead body across the street, and the perpetrator was still loose, and I knew that if we did not do something different in this country that my children would not be safe and the other children would not be safe.

I knew something then, and I know it today, that part of the answer is prevention. As my mother used to tell me, and as our mothers told us all, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We know that there is a Federal interest in safety or else we would not be doing this crime bill at all, and I think it is important that prevention of crime be part of this package throughout the country.

You know, when children get off on the wrong track early, we know they are going to get in trouble. We know they are going to cause pain to victims and their families, and we know that there is something, sometimes very little things, that we can do with children when they are 5 or 6 or 7 so that they will get on the right track. Those are the investments to make.

I believe that every locality needs to make them. I am a firm believer in local government and, in fact, I am not offended by much of the block grant nature of this bill and said so during the Committee on the Judiciary hearings. Nevertheless, I think we ought to let localities know who are going to participate in this Federal program that some section of that must be used for prevention. Let them use their own creativity. Let them meet local needs. But we need to prevent crime, because a child who is going to become a monster in Nebraska today could be in San Jose, CA, tomorrow, threatening my children.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the need for crime prevention programs. I have to say that, as a career criminal prosecutor and also a defense attorney for

2 years, I have found it hard to identify specifically what does prevent crime.

During one period of my career I was a specialist in the prosecuting of what we call white-collar crimes, frauds, embezzlements, and so forth. I prosecuted individual after individual who dressed well, spoke well, was well educated, had a job, had a good income, but was greedy for more. As a result, they defrauded the public, they embezzled from their employer, they committed all kinds of crimes, not necessarily as crude as robbing a convenience store at gunpoint, but the intent to steal was just as glaring.

The problem is this amendment does not allow, in the words of the gentleman from Virginia, the ingenuity of local government. We tell them in this amendment what programs they have to have at the local level and the nature of crime prevention; that is one of the serious things wrong with this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE], a member of the committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, because it will defeat the purpose of this legislation, which is to create the kind of flexibility for State and local governments to fight crime that this legislation is all about, and I would say to the proponents of the amendment that, quite frankly, we right now have in this bill \$2 billion a year, all of which can be used for prevention programs.

The bill itself specifically specifies, and I will read it, establishing crime prevention programs that may, though not exclusively, involve law enforcement officials that are intended to discourage, disrupt, or interfere with the commission of criminal activity, including neighborhood watch and citizen patrol programs, sexual assault and domestic violence programs, and programs intended to prevent juvenile crime, establishing or supporting drug courts, establishing early intervention and prevention programs for juveniles, to reduce or eliminate crime.

There are, in point of fact, hundreds of crime prevention programs all across this country that will effectively fight crime. The problem with this amendment is it only recognizes 10 of them and hands them over to the States and localities with all manner of strings attached to those programs with very specific guidelines that might be just fine in New York City but might not apply at all in Highland County, VA, in my district which has 2,500 people.

There is not a single community in my district with more than 100,000 people in it, and the way crime must be fought in different jurisdictions varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. That is also why we have taken the money from the Cops on the Beat Program

and put it into this same block grant, because the fact of the matter is not every community wants to or can qualify for the funding for the Cops on the Beat Program.

The President says we are going to get 100,000 new cops on the beat. If you divide that by 435 congressional districts, that comes to 230 per district. My district has received 15 new police officers in 8 of the 20 jurisdictions. Sixty percent of the jurisdictions in my district have either not applied for or not received funding under that program, and I have been talking to police chiefs and others in those communities and found out why. Some of them do not want to get dependent upon the Federal Government for a police officer and then have the funding end. Some of them do not feel a need for a police officer, but may feel a need for a crime prevention program, may feel a need for a drug court, may feel a need to have some form of equipment made available in fighting crime, computers or patrol cars or other things that can be made available to them.

All of these things should be left to the localities. Flexibility is needed. When we tie their hands with specific programs that are not needed in specific communities, we are doing absolutely nothing to fight crime in those communities, and this will tie the hands of those communities and, therefore, I urge the rejection of this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reassure the gentleman from Virginia that localities will have the opportunity, if that is his major gripe about this, to use the funds the way they want, because it includes the Local Partnership Act, so that that provision is included.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, how much is too much for our children? When we begin to look at what occurred with LEAA block grants, where there was no direction, we look at the purchase of \$140,000 aircraft, we look at \$27,000 to do some Xeroxing, we look at \$265,000 to give us a 2-page report, and then we look at \$200,000 to buy some land.

□ 2100

I wonder how much is too much for our children. All we are simply asking is to recognize that we have the responsibility to focus our local jurisdictions, not direct or restrict, but to focus them on the value and needs of prevention.

I would simply say to you, coming from local government, they welcome this. The cities, by and large, en masse, supported the 1994 bill that included the provisions for prevention. They

want it. They know what happens in our inner-city housing developments, what happens in our communities. What is too much for our children?

I ask for bipartisan support of the Conyers-Schumer amendment.

We need to have prevention programs.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us tonight does not give the flexibility that H.R. 728 will do. H.R. 728, without this amendment, will in fact give each community the right to establish law enforcement block grants, the right to have such programs as community policing, which has worked so well in Pennsylvania, where the police are tied in closely with community leaders and each person on each block. Our town watch programs, where each community works with either walking patrols or walking operations where they keep in touch with law enforcement officials. Or drug courts, which specialize in prosecutions that deal with violent crime and those that are drug-oriented. Or crimes against the elderly and the programs that work with our senior citizen organizations. Or even the child-lure program, the ones that prevent the exploitation and abduction of children in our communities.

All the law enforcement officers that I have spoken to in Pennsylvania feel that the block grant approach will give us the kind of flexibility that we need to truly fight the war against crime.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, before I got elected to Congress, I was the first assistant district attorney in Middlesex county. We had 13,000 criminal cases a year. Fighting crime is serious business. It requires a two pronged approach: One is priority prosecution to remove those individuals, the worst offenders, from society and put them away for as long as you can get them away. The challenge we face in law enforcement is what are we going to do with the majority of the people who remain?

There are countless examples from all over the country of priority prosecution programs. When they mix prevention programs and get police officers involved with the school and open up schools for kids to provide prevention programs, it works.

It is working in the city of Lowell, where crime prevention programs have resulted in dramatically lowering gang violence in that city. Crime prevention programs have worked in Summerville, MA, dramatically decreasing the rates of crime.

Fighting crime is not a political issue, it should not be partisan. It

should not be Republican versus Democrat. Let us keep what we passed 4 months ago. It was the best crime initiative that ever came from this Congress. And now we are getting involved in partisan politics.

It works. Let us keep it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the Local Partnership Act, which will be continued under the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], is, as we see it, one of the problems in the crime bill of 1994. The Local Partnership Act runs for 24 pages, and this is pages in the crime bill that are typed in very, very small print, as to what localities have to do to qualify for the money. That is exactly the reason why we are presenting H.R. 728 in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to advise the gentleman that the Local Partnership Act was the single most popular program by the cities that was in the crime bill of 1994, and that this is the flexibility that the gentleman from Virginia did not know was there, that would allow people to make these choices.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, our goal is to reduce crime. Studies show the effective way to do this is through crime prevention programs, education, recreation, job training programs, all of which have been studied, have been shown to reduce crime 10, 20, as much as 80 percent.

Not only have fewer victims, but you also save money. We have heard of the drug courts, one-twentieth of the cost, 80 percent reduction in crime.

If your goal is to reduce crime, Mr. Chairman, properly designed prevention programs work. Without the Conyers amendment, it is going to be business-as-usual; no prevention, wait for the crimes to occur, and then deal with the consequences. It is simply a matter of pay now or pay a lot more later.

Prevent crime. It works. Support the Conyers amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the bottom line of all of this is simple and straightforward; that is that many of us on this side of the aisle simply do not agree with that side on the idea that we know best about how to do prevention programs around the country. There are thousands of options. The gentleman from Michigan is once again reiterating a laundry list of those things he thinks are best, including this Partnership Act, that, as far as I can determine, is based upon the high-

est tax-rate cities in the country, not the highest crime-rate cities. I find this approach to be abhorrent. I think it is the wrong kind of approach. I know he means well by it. What we need is maximum flexibility to let every community participate and determine whether they want one program or the other. There are hundreds of cities around this country that might differ with the gentleman on how they would spend the money. They might not want to spend it on one of these particular programs that the gentleman has offered about a billion dollars a year. Hannibal, MO, might not like what Paducah, KY, wants to have. Certainly they are not going to agree with San Francisco or Detroit or some of our larger cities.

This is the reason why last year's crime bill is so wrong and why this year's crime bill on local block grants for the communities of our country that decide for themselves on whether to spend it on cops or prevention is so right.

So I urge, with all due respect to the gentleman, a "no" vote on this amendment and to keep the bill as it is.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in the Committee on the Judiciary today members of the majority, who are talking now about the absolute wisdom of the States, were talking about a piece of legislation dealing with product liability which would take away from the State powers that they have had since the Union was created. I have never seen a sharper degree of inconsistency than we get from the other side on the question of State versus Federal.

Last week they were for Federal dictation on prisons. This week they are for States' rights here, but they are for Federal dictation when business is involved with product liability changes.

There is one thread of consistency: They are frustrated that last year we were able to get together on a good crime bill. If we were in fact starting from scratch, this might be a better argument to have. We are well along in the process of getting the money out and getting the people to work under last year's crime bill.

This is a disruption, for partisan purposes, of a program that has begun to work because the people who want to argue that Government can never work hate nothing more than the sight of government working well.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and want to voice my concern with the argument that somehow we are allowing flexibility. We took away flexibility, in my judgment, when we said we know what is best for States: They have to have prisons, but

they cannot have more money for cops on the beat and what I think are prevention programs.

If we want flexibility, if we on our side are saying we are going to let everyone decide, then why did we not put the prison money in with prevention and enforcement?

My problem is I think this is a direct assault on the prevention programs. Maybe I am one of the few Members on this side of the aisle who represents an urban area, where in my areas police chiefs in Stamford, Norwalk, and Bridgeport put more weight on prevention than they do on cops on the beat.

Candidly, I have seen cops on the beat go to some of my wealthiest suburban communities that do not need them. We need programs that will help young people not go through a life of crime. In Fairfield, CT, which I represent, the people now have so many programs after school and during school and on weekends, they do not have a hard time not doing something, their challenge is what don't they do.

In Bridgeport, CT, when school is out, they are left on their own, in most cases in a latchkey environment with no parent, no adult supervision. We have an after-school program, we have weekend school programs. These kids are hungry for preventive programs. I do not buy for a minute that we are saying we want flexibility. If we wanted flexibility, we would have put prison money in this package.

□ 2110

Instead we took money out of the police, out of enforcement, out of prevention, and gave it to prisons. My State does not need to build more prisons. It needs to decide who better should be in the prisons.

I support this amendment. I urge its passage. I say to my colleagues, If you represented an urban area, you would know prevention programs are more important than anything else we could do.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has no time remaining. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to close.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond first to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], my friend, on the view that having a prison funding grant is inconsistent with supporting flexibility. The argument was also made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The fact of the matter is that might be true if no State used prisons, but every State, unfortunately as it may be, has found the need to have prisons. What we did in the bill that offered grants for prisons is to simply recognize that those States that increase the amount of time to be served by violent criminals would incur automatically greater

costs for that, and, since money is not unlimited, we thought the best use of prison funds was to help those States which are incurring the greater costs through their determination to protect their citizens.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, on the subject of prevention we agree that there ought to be prevention programs. We agree that there ought to be police. Our bill gives the maximum flexibility to communities to decide what they need best. The gentleman from Connecticut said that some communities in this State did not need more police. Some others might decide they do not need more police. We leave it to them, and if in fact we are going to block off any amounts of money, which I do not support, we should not do it by word-for-word simply incorporating the bureaucratic programs that are found in the crime bill of last year, in which Washington dictates step-by-step and page-by-page: "Here are your prevention programs, you must use these programs, and here is how you're going to do it."

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleagues, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. SCHUMER.

As a former City Council member, I have been fighting throughout my career to demand that local governments get direct funding and flexibility. But in this case, I seriously question whether H.R. 728 will give local governments the true flexibility they want.

Although H.R. 728 claims it will allow cities to spend money on whatever they want, the bill does not supply enough funds to sufficiently support the comprehensive crime-fighting initiatives of our cities.

In practice, H.R. 728 would result in cities sacrificing prevention programs, without guaranteeing that any police officers would be added.

This is a decision no city wants to make because locally-elected officials know that crime prevention works.

The City of Chula Vista in my district has urged Congress not to cut funding for the successful prevention programs they have initiated. And the National League of Cities recently stated that any anti-crime legislation must include support for anti-drug abuse, crime and violence prevention programs.

But up here in Congress, supporters of today's bill clearly do not see crime prevention as important. And these Washingtonians are imposing that belief onto our local governments by refusing to supply cities with the funds they need to truly fight crime in a comprehensive way.

H.R. 728 would eliminate the desperately needed community policing and crime prevention programs of last year's crime bill, and without this amendment, cut nearly \$2.5 billion from the money intended to go to local crime fighting. This would destroy the crime bill's wise and reasonable balance between enforcement, punishment, and prevention.

We need stiffer penalties and we need to keep criminals off our streets, but we also need crime prevention programs to stop crime before it starts.

Crime prevention works. It works when school and community-based programs give kids a place to go after school and give them something positive to do. It works when police officers forge relationships with at-risk youth and teach them how to stay from crime. And it works when drug abuse programs rehabilitate individuals and get them back into the work force.

In San Diego, a program called Safe Haven has been particularly successful, and I would like to read a bit about that program from an article recently printed in the San Diego Union Tribune.

Until Anthony Majadi established a Safe Haven program in Southcrest Park a year ago, prostitution flourished in the parking lot, basketball players brought booze to the gym and the drug trade dominated.

The park is now a different place.

With a budget of \$160,000, Safe Haven helped hundreds of children and adults through its myriad activities, including instruction in martial arts and computers, homework assistance, summer day camp and other programs.

Safe Haven is part of a national program and federal government established to complement seeding efforts in the Weed and Seed target areas. Safe Haven is held out as an example of what weed and seed can do—benefit a community beyond drug raids and gang sweeps.

Programs like Safe Haven make our neighborhoods safer, they improve the lives of our children, and they bring tremendous cost savings to our criminal justice system.

In the words of a concerned citizen in my district: "Killing funding for crime prevention programs demonstrates a disheartedly shortsighted, simplistic and self-defeating approach to the Nation's crime problems."

This debate should not pit prevention against enforcement. We need them both. We need to combine them in a comprehensive approach to fighting crime. And it is irresponsible for Federal lawmakers to make local governments choose between the two.

We have to address the causes of crime—not just the symptoms. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment—and to join me in continuing the long-term strategy to crime control that we started last year.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MENENDEZ

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MENENDEZ: Page 13, after line 4, insert the following:

"(e) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENT.—A unit of local government qualifies for a payment under this title for a payment period only if the unit's expenditures on law enforcement services (as reported by the Bureau of the Census) for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the payment period occurs were not less than 90 percent of the unit's expenditures on such services for the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the payment period occurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be brief.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to clarify and strengthen language in the bill requiring that Federal funds granted to local governments supplement, not supplant, local spending on law enforcement.

I understand that the chairman of the subcommittee has had an opportunity to review the amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to accept the amendment. It is a good amendment. It makes it very, very clear that we are not supplementing funds the way we want to. We want to make that protection, and I would agree with the gentleman in accepting the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, we are happy to accept the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 12, after line 7, add the following:

"(10) the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform nonadministrative public safety service if such unit uses funds received under this title to increase the number of law enforcement officers as described under subparagraph (A), (B), (C) of section 101(a)(2)."

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the Traficant amendment says that there shall be a net gain of non-administrative police officers as a result of funding under this bill, which basically means that there will be a few more Indians around. We do a lot of talking about cops on the beat, and I am not even sure the last crime bill did that. This will ensure that with any police officers hired under this bill, there would be a net gain of Indians on the street.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment. The gentleman is correct. It is an excellent proposal that makes sure that we are really going to get the net gain in police we want. It is better, as the gentleman says, than anything that we had even in the last year's bill relative to this kind of restriction, so I thank him for offering it. I accept the amendment and encourage its adoption.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, with that I wholeheartedly support the amendment and ask that it be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUNDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 748) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR ALL COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW AND THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves: that all Committees of the House and their subcommittees have permission to sit tomorrow, February 14, and for the balance of the week while the House is meeting under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I do not intend to take the full hour allotted to me.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], I would say that the hour is late, and I hope we will be able to adjourn shortly.

In the meantime, all Members should be advised that we are very likely to have one more vote before this evening is over.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules today approved an outrageous gag rule for the National Security Act. It cuts off debate. It blocks important amendments.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, to be clear for the RECORD, I yielded this time to the gentleman from Michigan for purposes of debate only.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has yielded for purposes of debate only. There is nothing to object to at this point.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman yielded 30 minutes without reservations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] clarified his yielding, and this is for purposes of debate only.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

□ 2120

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this rule that was put out this afternoon by the Republican leadership on the Committee on Rules is a gag rule for our National Security Act. It cuts off debate, it blocks important amendments, and it does so under a 10-hour time limit.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is too important. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider in this session of Congress or in this Congress.

The Republicans want to completely rewrite the foreign policy of the United States in 10 hours. They want to reconstruct the entire defense policy and return to the days of star wars in 10 hours. They want to restrict the military's ability to respond to emergencies around the world in 10 hours. They want to completely rethink our relationship with our NATO allies in 10 hours.

Mr. Speaker, this does not make any sense. We have tried throughout the day to negotiate without colleagues on this side of the aisle to give us adequate debate so we can take on these important issues which affect the national security of our country in a reasonable amount of time where Members of this floor can get up and express themselves with amendments that make sense for this country. And we find ourselves in a situation tonight where we have to object.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important pieces of foreign policy legislation to be considered by Congress in years.

Mr. Speaker, if you talk to the distinguished ranking Members on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and others who have labored in these areas for years and decades, they will tell you it is an outrage we are going to

consider this piece of legislation for only 10 hours.

Why do my Republican colleagues feel that they need to rush this bill through without adequate debate, without an opportunity for Members to offer amendments? I will tell you why. Because they want to punch another little hole in their Contract With America. They want to check off another item on the list.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you do not write good laws by punching little cards, and you do not write good laws by rushing to judgment on issues that concern the national security of this country.

That is not the way to protect this Nation. We ask for a reasonable amount of time, and we have been told 10 hours is all you are going to get, for foreign policy, for defense policy, for policy that deals with our most important allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It just will not do. You could spend 10 hours on the debate alone between troop readiness and star wars, which is a piece of the debate we are about to have in this bill as we approach it in the next couple of days.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say as strongly as I can on behalf of myself and the rest of the Democratic leadership, we feel this is an injustice and we will not stand for it, and we want to make our voices heard this evening on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my dear colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this urge to measure legislation by sheer volume of bills passed has really now come up against reality. This 10-hour limitation was perfectly sensible for some of the bills we have been doing this week. They were single issue bills. We did 10 hours on prisons, 10 hours on the prevention police. We bump up against it a little bit, but they are reasonable.

This 10-hour model now is applying to an omnibus bill that takes in vast areas of national security, of foreign policy, and of defense. Remember out of the 10 hours comes rollcalls. If you have four or five rollcalls, you have eaten up a couple of hours by the amount of time they will take. We will debate what our relationship should be with NATO, what new nations will come into NATO, do we go back to star wars, what is our relationship to peacekeeping, what are our requirements when the United States participates in multinational peacekeeping, all in 10 hours.

By the way, the hard working majority plans to leave town at 3 o'clock on Thursday. This is 10 hours compressing the most important issues this Nation faces, so we can get out of town early.

Well, let us wait until next week, if the vacation is irresistible. Frankly, for those who are prepared simply to take marching and voting orders, 10

hours may be OK. If you have checked your independent thought processes at the door and are ready to walk in here and be told what to do, I suppose 10 minutes would probably do it, if you can check them off like that.

But those of us who think this country is entitled to serious discussion of these issues understand, 10 hours is the most debasing and degrading approach to the legislative process I have ever seen, particularly when it is for the convenience of an early vacation.

One of the issues that I was hoping we would raise, and I have talked to Members on the other side, is burden sharing, which this House forced on the administration. It is bipartisan, the opposition to burden sharing. Republican and Democratic Presidents alike have resisted it, and we insisted on it. We cannot adequately do that in 10 hours.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deal with this large range of issues that have been put together. If you are, in fact, prepared simply to do as you are told, if you have presigned on and do not need to think about it, OK. But the notion that in 10 hours, with time out for votes, you can redefine our relationships to the United Nations and NATO, reconstruct our defense command structure, redefine the powers of the President, all within a 10-hour period, which will include general debate, which will include time for the rules, it is a degradation of the legislative process.

By the way, once again we are being told that one of the reforms the Republicans brought to us gets checked at the door. One of the great reforms was the reinstitution of the rule that said we will not have you on the floor when the committees are meeting. They apparently put that reform in so they could waive it every week. They have waived that rule more than they have waived the contract. That rule has been dispensed with virtually every week, so that Members will be expected to be on the floor and deal with the questions of NATO and SDI, et cetera, and at the same time simultaneously be in committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is taking the legislative process hostage so you can fulfill a political promise that turned out to be more difficult than you thought. No one would describe 10 hours as remotely adequate to deal with these very important issues. What the majority is trying to do is to cram into an obviously inadequate period of time a series of difficult issues, and in part, because this one is beginning to unravel. This one is beginning to engender opposition from Republicans who have served in high defense and national security positions.

The implications of this one will not bear scrutiny. Ten hours of debate is absolutely a breach of faith with the Democratic process and it will engender, I believe on our side, an appropriate response. People who tell us that we cannot take adequate time to deal with these issues cannot expect to be

treated by us as partners in the ongoing legislative process when they have so dishonored it.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just so the newer Members on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle understand historically what has happened on defense security issues, when we have had defense bills before this body, defense authorization bills, over the last several years, we have spent up to 2 weeks on those bills. We have had over 200 amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules, and we have considered 50 to 100 amendments on the House floor.

What you are doing to us now is allowing no more than three or four amendments to be considered, and that only in a limited amount of time. You are shutting off debate on such important issues as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out on burden sharing, which will require our allies to share some of the defense burden that we have picked up for so long.

That is not a fair way to do business. It is not a fair way to do business. And what will you have gained by all this? Do you think the other body, for all its faults, and it has faults, is going to stand by and let this happen? Do you think they are going to take your product of 10 hours and process it and deliver it to the President?

Nonsense. Nonsense. They are going to talk about NATO and give it the time that it deserves, and it is going to be your Republican colleagues and Senators in the other body who will lead the way on that. And they will do the same thing. They will talk about the defense issues and the security issues that we brought to you this evening.

So we are terribly upset about this, as you can obviously see, and we will be raising our voices today, tomorrow, and the next day to make sure that we get some justice and some due time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

□ 2130

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I am just curious, NATO has been rather important to this country for 45 years, almost 50 years. Were there extensive hearings in committee as we write new law to change that historic relationship?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Minnesota, as I understand it, there were 3 half-day hearings to consider the defense, foreign policy issues and intelligence issues that are in this bill, 3 half-day hearings.

Mr. SABO. So it is not only a limited amendment, but it is something that sort of rushed through committee that is changing this historic relationship that our country has had with our allies?

Mr. BONIOR. Well, basically the whole contract has been rushed

through. But we understand some of the concerns on the other side of the aisle over some of the issues that my friend from Massachusetts raised. They could be debated within a framework of a few hours or 5 hours or 6 hours. But we are talking about the national security of the American public and of this country. We cannot do that in 10 hours.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask my colleagues to consider for a moment what we are about here this evening.

This bill, H.R. 7, addresses many important topics. We have spent about \$30 billion on star wars. There is a serious question of how much we should spend and whether we would do that and sacrifice the readiness of America's Armed Forces. That is worthy of a debate that all Members should be involved in.

There is also a question in this bill as to the role of Commander in Chief of the United States. Over the 12 years that I have served in this body, I can remember many, many times when we have taken days and often weeks to debate the application of that constitutional provision in terms of the security of the United States.

There are questions in this bill as well about the future of NATO. And it has been alluded to here that this is one seminal debate on our new relationship in this so-called new world order.

I might say to my colleagues that they may dismiss this as just another check mark on the TV Guide ad. It is much more than that to a lot of different people.

During the last week or two, since the 3 half-days of debate on this bill, I have had people come to me, Americans, who have friends and relatives who live in parts of the world who have traditionally been our allies, genuinely concerned about the impact of this bill on the future security of these nations.

Finally, of course, this bill addresses peacekeeping, and that, my colleagues, literally addresses life and death issues for America's young men and women.

That is how serious this bill is. I know there is a strong partisan feeling on this floor, and I have seen it manifest many times on both sides of the aisle over the years. But I would like to address this comment to the new Members on both sides of the aisle.

Many of my colleagues did not serve, and probably did not witness, one of the most important debates in the history of this institution. I was privileged enough to be here for that debate. It was the debate over the entry of the United States into the Persian Gulf war.

A decision was made by the leadership of the House that this issue was so critically important, involving the life and death of American citizens, that if necessary we would stay in session around the clock so that every Member would be able to express their heartfelt

feelings. When it was over and the debate ended, most people credited that debate as one of our finest hours in the House of Representatives.

We took the time to do it right, because the issue was so important.

I beg my colleagues now, we would not do it this evening, but tomorrow, when Members meet with their Republican leaders, ask them to pause and give some consideration to the fact that this, too, is a life or death issue. We owe the people we represent the time to sit down, deliberate, and make the right decision.

I hope that my colleagues will prevail on the Committee on Rules and their leadership to give us the time to adequately address these critically important issues.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that Rome was not built in a single day, only the Republican majority, though, could think they can build the entire U.S. relationship with the world in 10 hours.

What we are debating, will be debating in that brief period of time, ranges literally the world. It is what our sons and daughters do in the Armed Forces. It is what the role of the Armed Forces is. It is, what role does the United Nations have. What about burden sharing, our relationship with many other parts of the world.

I cannot believe that anyone seriously want to spend just 10 hours on it. I understand there is a contract. But does that contract really go further than the water's edge in terms of our national security?

Members can say that, "No, BOB, we don't limit you. It is an open rule in the sense of you can offer any amendment you can."

But what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that they have limited the time. And when they limit the time and add in to that the debate or the vote time, what they do is they do limit amendments. And by adding in the time to actually come over and vote, what they have done is forced Members to decide, do I debate or do I vote? Do I ask for a vote on some of these crucial, crucial issues?

I guess what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that under this rule, as I understand it, it will be 10 hours to debate this entire bill. The Republican majority is going to spend less time debating this bill than it actually will take to fly to some of these countries one day to see what their concerns really are. Indeed, if a congressional delegation's flight time was measured by these bills, these planes would not be able to make it past Hawaii as we explore Asia or other parts of far distant Europe.

I would just urge, Mr. Speaker, for Members to think about this overnight. I do not pretend to be a very senior Member around here, but I remember on some of the military bills and armed services bills, spending 30 or

40 hours because Members thought it was that important. Incidentally, 30 or 40 hours basically taking up amendments from the other side, from this Republican side of the aisle.

I would urge Members to reconsider this and the Committee on Rules to reconsider this. Surely, our country's national security deserves more than 10 hours debate with vote time included.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since very early in this session of Congress, I have been addressing on a number of occasions the process by which we deliberate and consider laws for this country.

I debated and took issue with the cutting off of debate on an important bill in the Committee on the Judiciary. I have debated on a number of occasions on this floor the process by which we consider issues. It seems to me that we have now gotten to the point where it is not the process of debate or the process for reaching a reasonable result that is at issue but simply reaching that result because some Contract With America or contract on America was made with the people.

Our primary obligation, Mr. Speaker, is to deliberate and study the issues that come before us and to debate those issues for the American people. The value of this body is the diversity that we bring to this body and the ability to hear the various perspectives of people from throughout this Nation that 435 Representatives bring here and offer in the debate.

□ 2140

If there is not sufficient time to debate, then that diversity cannot be honored.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to reconsider this issue. Give us ample time to debate it. Do not tell the American people on one hand that we are opening up the process and having a deliberative form of government, that we are going to have 10 hours of debate while we count the voting time, 15 minutes for each vote, so if we offer 10 amendments, more than 2½ hours will be gone just in the amendment and voting process. Let us be honest with the American people, and if we are going to tell them that we believe in an open society, believe in open debate, let us demonstrate it here on the floor of the House and have open debate, and have unlimited time for the debate of these issues.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I take the well not because I want to delay our departure, but because I think what we are doing with H.R. 7 is we are engaging in playing politics with one of the most im-

portant jobs we have here. That is measuring what we think is needed for the national security of our country and for our leadership in this new and evolving world that is so difficult for all of us to understand.

Mr. Speaker, what are we doing in this bill? Think about this. We are communicating to the rest of the world that we are not going to play in the United Nations anymore, we do not like the way it is run, so forget the humanitarian missions, the Americans will not be there. Boy, there is a heavy message.

We are also saying, "We are going to tell them which countries ought to come into NATO." Mr. Speaker, any country that is in NATO as a full member means that we are committed to defend their security, so if Chechnya had been allowed into NATO we would now have troops over there fighting. Now maybe that is a good idea, but do we do that with 10 hours of debate? Do we do that without consulting our allies? Do we have any idea that the United Nations and NATO are bodies that have other countries that belong, and they think they should have some input in this, too, and the administration should?

Mr. Speaker, we are also taking and giving the Pentagon a nanny. We are giving them a commission, a political commission. We are politicizing all of this. Mr. Speaker, that is real smart. That is what we need, are more layers, more layers, and we are going to do that in the 10 hours.

When we look at the commitments we are making budgetarily, Mr. Speaker, we are committing to a space-based defense: bring back star wars for nostalgia's sake. There is applause over there, they cannot wait. The guess is going to be that is \$40 billion for the opening shot, and heaven only knows where it goes and if it will ever work, at a time when readiness is a much more critical concern, I think, and when, if we look at the real fear, it is the fact that somebody could bring nuclear weapons in and do another World Trade Center.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what space-based defense is going to do against a world issue. I know it is funny, and I know that people think, "Let's just hurry on and punch this hole in the contract," but I think the rest of the world is going to look over here and say, "What is going on?" I must say as a Member who has been here a while, Mr. Speaker, if we as Democrats had ever done this, the other side of the aisle would have gone crazy, to come in here and say we are going to redo all of the U.N. stuff, we are going to redo NATO, we are going to not deal with burdensharing, we will keep being the policeman of the world, we are going to run everything, we are going to do star wars, we are going to do it in 10 hours, and we are going to put a politicized commission running

the Pentagon. This is an absolute outrage. I really hope people think about this.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me.

I know the hour is late, but I happen to represent over 40,000 Army soldiers at Fort Hood, TX. I do not come to this floor often. If Members will look at my record over 4 years, I seldom come this floor in a partisan manner.

However, Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor at this late hour in saying to my colleagues that this is an important issue. We ought to look beyond partisanship in deciding how much time is it worth for us to debate our national security issues.

I am a hawk on defense, Mr. Speaker. I believe we ought to spend more on defense. If I could get to the right of the gentleman from Texas, CHARLIE WILSON, on defense, I would do it. I believe national defense, along with many of my colleagues, is the single most important responsibility of the Federal Government, and it deserves more than 10 hours of debate.

If it does not deserve it, Mr. Speaker, then certainly the lives of our men and women in the Services deserve it. How much is the life of one Army soldier worth? 10 Hours? How much is the life of one Marine worth? 10 hours? How much is the life of thousands and thousands of American servicemen and women worth? Certainly it should be worth more than 10 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that the Contract that we sign as Members of Congress to try to protect the lives of the men and women brave enough to put their lives on the line for us, that that contract is more important than the time schedule of a Contract for America.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority whip for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest surprises I have had since I have been on the Committee on Rules was today, when I was told about this other contract that the Republican party had come up with.

We are not talking this bill up until Wednesday. I asked what the purpose was of not giving us at least 24 hours, to go around the clock, to bring these amendments forward, because it deals with three very heavy subject matters.

I am sure that Star Wars sticks in some people's throat when they talk about it. Probably the quicker they get through speaking about it, the better they will feel. However, when we are talking about an item that can go up to \$46 billion, and the Republicans can

spend hours in the Committee on Rules on bills that we sent on the suspension calendar, when they can break the police bill up into 8 hours, and yet, give less than 12 hours on something as important as this, because they have to know what their schedule is, well, I told them they do not have to know what their schedule is. They have the votes, they can vote it.

However, I think this is one of the votes that the Republican Party will never forget. This is a very giant vote. It is something I have never seen in all my time on the Committee on Rules. We used to get accused of gagging people, but on this one, they have a tourniquet right around all our necks.

They just do not want to allow anybody, and they think it is funny over there, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to see this appear in every one of their newspapers, on how little they care for the defense of our country when it comes to intelligence, when it comes to star wars, when it comes to other matters contained in this bill; the bailout.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in this country. The desert war was a great day, when it was a wide open rule, anybody could speak.

Maybe I should not have said that, because every day the term "open rule" gets changed. I am waiting for the new Republican dictionary to hit my desk, so I really know what they mean by an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, they accused us of violating the open rules, and it was a difficult description of what they now say is an open rule. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that people over there, first-termers, at least, will take a very close look at this, because as I said, this is going to come back to haunt all of them.

□ 2150

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The gentleman is advised that he has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. May I ask how much time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman wish to use any of his time?

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Let me be very clear that the majority does not wish to respond to our concerns and requests this evening.

Let me just close by suggesting to all of us here this evening that when it comes to our national defense, there really is no time limit, and what we are about to do this Wednesday and Thursday is to gag this institution in a way that frankly I have not seen in a long time.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman from New York knows full well what I am speaking about. When we had a national defense bill on this floor, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] spent a full 2 weeks

each and every time he would bring it to the floor. Amendments were made in order so all Members of this body had an opportunity to participate in a free and a fair way. We are not having that now. We are dealing with the most important and crucial issues that will face this institution and this body in this Congress, the defense of this Nation, the safety of our young men and women who are defending this country.

When you talk about peacekeeping, when you talk about Haiti or Bosnia or the Middle East or Somalia, you are talking about whether or not we are going to have peace or we are going to have war. And 10 hours is not enough time. There is no time limit on our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall use.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the body that the motion before the House is that all committees of the House and their subcommittees have permission to sit tomorrow, February 14 and for the balance of the week while the House is meeting under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard since January 4 and we have already accomplished a great deal. House Republicans have applied the laws of the land to a Congress which for years saw fit to exempt itself from what it imposed upon others.

With bipartisan support House Republicans brought up and passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. With bipartisan support we passed legislation ending unfunded mandates, and we have already passed wide-ranging crime legislation including strong and effective death penalty legislation.

Oftentimes Democrats have voted with us and we appreciate it as do the American people who have been demanding these and other reforms for years. But we have much, much more work to do and we will get it done in 100 days as we promised.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to moving the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 22, as follows:

McDermott	Payne (VA)	Stenholm
McHale	Pelosi	Stokes
McKinney	Peterson (FL)	Studds
McNulty	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Meehan	Pickett	Tanner
Meek	Pomeroy	Tauzin
Menendez	Poshard	Taylor (MS)
Mfume	Rahall	Tejeda
Miller (CA)	Rangel	Thompson
Mineta	Reed	Thornton
Minge	Reynolds	Thurman
Mink	Richardson	Torres
Moakley	Rivers	Torricelli
Mollohan	Roemer	Towns
Montgomery	Roybal-Allard	Trafficant
Moran	Rush	Velazquez
Murtha	Sabo	Vento
Nadler	Sanders	Visclosky
Neal	Sawyer	Volkmer
Oberstar	Schroeder	Ward
Obey	Schumer	Waters
Olver	Scott	Watt (NC)
Ortiz	Serrano	Waxman
Orton	Sisisky	Wise
Owens	Skaggs	Woolsey
Pallone	Skelton	Wyden
Parker	Slaughter	Wynn
Pastor	Spratt	Yates
Payne (NJ)	Stark	

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra	Gibbons	Oxley
Berman	Hefner	Rose
Clement	Jefferson	Shuster
Clinger	Leach	Tucker
Cox	Martinez	Whitfield
Crapo	Matsui	Williams
Dooley	McCrery	Wilson
Fattah	McDade	

□ 2226

Mr. WATT of North Carolina changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, THE NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-31) on the resolution (H. Res. 83) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 555

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill H.R. 555.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MIDDLE CLASS BILL OF RIGHTS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-34)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without

objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995." I am also sending you an explanation of the revenue proposals of this legislation.

This bill is the next step in my Administration's continuing effort to raise living standards for working families and help restore the American Dream for all our people.

For 2 years, we have worked hard to strengthen our economy. We worked with the last Congress to enact legislation that will reduce the annual deficits of 1994-98 by more than \$600 billion; we created nearly 6 million new jobs; we cut taxes for 15 million low-income families and gave tax relief to small businesses; we opened export markets through global and regional trade agreements; we invested in human and physical capital to increase productivity; and we reduced the Federal Government by more than 100,000 positions.

With that strong foundation in place, I am now proposing a Middle Class Bill of Rights. Despite our progress, too many Americans are still working harder for less. The Middle Class Bill of Rights will enable working Americans to raise their families and get the education and training they need to meet the demands of a new global economy. It will let middle-income families share in our economic prosperity today and help them build our economic prosperity tomorrow.

The "Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995" includes three of the four elements of my Middle Class Bill of Rights. First, it offers middle-income families a \$500 tax credit for each child under 13. Second, it includes a tax deduction of up to \$10,000 a year to help middle-income Americans pay for post-secondary education expenses and training expenses. Third, it lets more middle-income Americans make tax-deductible contributions to Individual Retirement Accounts and withdraw from them, penalty-free, for the costs of education and training, health care, first-time home-buying, long periods of unemployment, or the care of an ill parent.

The fourth element of my Middle Class Bill of Rights—not included in this legislation—is the GI Bill for America's Workers, which consolidates 70 Federal training programs and creates a more effective system for learning new skills and finding better jobs for adults and youth. Legislation for this proposal is being developed in cooperation with the Congress.

If enacted, the Middle Class Bill of Rights will help keep the American Dream alive for everyone willing to take responsibility for themselves, their families, and their futures. And it will not burden our children with more debt. In my fiscal 1996 budget, we have

found enough savings not only to pay for this tax bill, but also to provide another \$81 billion in deficit reduction between 1996 and 2000.

This legislation will restore fairness to our tax system, let middle-income families share in our economic prosperity, encourage Americans to prepare for the future, and help ensure that the United States moves into the 21st Century still the strongest nation in the world. I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1995.

WORKING WAGE INCREASE ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-33)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Working Wage Increase Act of 1995."

This draft bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage in two 45 cents steps—from the current rate of \$4.25 an hour to \$4.70 an hour on July 4, 1995, and to \$5.15 an hour after July 3, 1996. The pattern of the proposed increase is identical to that of the last increase, which passed the Congress with a broad bipartisan majority and was signed by President Bush in 1989. The first increment of the proposal simply restores the minimum wage to its real value following the change enacted in 1989.

If the Congress does not act now, the minimum wage will fall to its lowest real level in 40 years. That would dishonor one of the great promises of American life—that everyone who works hard can earn a living wage. More than 11 million workers would benefit under this proposal, and a full-time, year-round worker at the minimum wage would get a \$1,800 raise—the equivalent of 7 months of groceries for the average family.

To reform the Nation's welfare system, we should make work pay, and this legislation would help achieve that result. It would offer a raise to families that are working hard, but struggling to make ends meet. Most individuals earning the minimum wage are adults, and the average worker affected by this proposal brings home half of the family's earnings. Numerous empirical studies indicate that an increase in the minimum wage of the magnitude proposed would not have a significant impact on employment. The legislation would ensure that those who work hard

and play by the rules can live with the dignity they have earned.

I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1995.

□ 2230

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Two years ago I took office determined to improve the lives of average American families. I proposed, and the Congress enacted, a new economic strategy to restore the American dream. Two years later, that strategy has begun to pay off.

Together we have created an environment in which America's private sector has been able to produce more than 5 million new jobs. Manufacturing employment grew during each month of 1994—the first time that has happened since 1978. We have cut the deficit in the Federal budget for 3 years running, we have kept inflation in check, and based on actions I have already taken, the Federal bureaucracy will soon be the smallest it has been in more than 3 decades. We have opened up more new trade opportunities in just 2 years than in any similar period in a generation. And we have embarked on a new partnership with American industry to prepare the American people to compete and win in the new global economy.

In short, America's economic prospects have improved considerably in the last 2 years. And the economy will continue to move forward in 1995, with rising output, falling deficits, and increasing employment. Today there is no country in the world with an economy as strong as ours, as full opportunity, as full of hope.

Still, living standards for many Americans have not improved as the economy has expanded. For the last 15 years, those Americans with the most education and the greatest flexibility to seek new opportunities have seen their incomes grow. But the rest of our work force have seen their incomes either stagnate or fall. An America that, in our finest moments, have always grown together, now grows apart.

I am resolved to keep the American dream alive in this new economy. We must make it possible for the American people to invest in the education of their children and in their own training and skills. This is the essence of the New Covenant I have called for—economic opportunity provided in return for people assuming personal re-

sponsibility. This is the commitment my Administration made to the American people 2 years ago, and it remains our commitment to them today.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC STRATEGY

Our economic strategy has been straightforward. First, we have pursued deficit reduction to increase the share of the Nation's economic resources available for private investment. At the same time we have reoriented the government's public investment portfolio with an eye toward preparing our people and our economy for the 21st century. We have cut yesterday's government to help solve tomorrow's problems, shrinking departments, cutting unnecessary regulations, and ending programs that have outlived their usefulness. We have also worked to expand trade and to boost American sales to foreign markets, so that the American people can enjoy the better jobs and higher wages that should result from their own high-quality, high-productivity labor. Having fixed the fundamentals, we are now proposing what I call the Middle Class Bill of Rights, an effort to build on the progress we have made in controlling the deficit while providing tax relief that is focused on the people who need it most.

PUTTING OUR OWN HOUSE IN ORDER

The first task my Administration faced upon taking office in January 1993 was to put our own economic house in order. For more than a decade, the Federal Government had spent much more than it took in, borrowing the difference. As a consequence, by 1992 the Federal deficit had increased to 4.9 percent of gross domestic product—and our country had gone from being the world's largest creditor Nation to being its largest debtor.

As a result of my Administration's deficit reduction package, passed and signed into law in August 1993, the deficit in fiscal 1994 was \$50 billion lower than it had been the previous year. In fact, it was about \$100 billion lower than had been forecast before our budget plan was enacted. Between fiscal 1993 and fiscal 1998, our budget plan will reduce the deficit by \$616 billion. Our fiscal 1996 budget proposal includes an additional \$81 billion in deficit reduction through fiscal 2000.

PREPARING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO COMPETE AND WIN

As we were taking the necessary steps to restore fiscal discipline to the Federal Government, we were also working to reorient the government's investment portfolio to prepare our people and our economy for 21st-century competition.

Training and Education. In our new information-age economy, learning must become a way of life. Learning begins in childhood, and the opportunity to learn must be available to every American child—that is why we have worked hard to expand Head Start.

With the enactment of Goals 2000 we have established worldclass standards

for our Nation's schools. Through the School-to-Work Opportunities Act we have created new partnerships with schools and businesses to make sure that young people make a successful transition to the world of work. We have also dramatically reformed the college loan program. Americans who aspire to a college degree need no longer fear that taking out a student loan will one day leave them overburdened by debt.

Finally, we are proposing to take the billions of dollars that the government now spends on dozens of training programs and make that money directly available to working Americans. We want to leave it up to *them* to decide what new skills they need to learn—and when—to get a new or better job.

New Technology.—Technological innovation is the engine driving the new global economy. This Administration is committed to fostering innovation in the private sector. We have reoriented the Federal Government's investment portfolio to support fundamental science and industry-led technology partnerships, the rapid deployment and commercialization of civilian technologies, and funding for technology infrastructure in transportation, communications, and manufacturing.

A Middle Class Bill of Rights. Fifty years ago the GI Bill of Rights helped transform an economy geared for war into one of the most successful peacetime economies in history. Today, after a peaceful resolution of the cold war, middle-class Americans have a right to move into the 21st century with the same opportunity to achieve the American dream.

People ought to be able to deduct the cost of education and training after high school from their taxable incomes. If a family makes less than \$120,000 a year, the tuition that family pays for college, community college, graduate school, professional school, vocational education, or worker training should be fully deductible, up to \$10,000 a year. If a family makes \$75,000 a year or less, that family should receive a tax cut, up to \$500, for every child under the age of 13. If a family makes less than \$100,000 a year, that family should be able to put \$2,000 a year, tax free, into an individual retirement account from which it can withdraw, tax free, money to pay for education, health care, a first home, or the care of an elderly parent.

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY AT HOME THROUGH FREE AND FAIR TRADE

Our efforts to prepare the American people to compete and win in the new global economy cannot succeed unless we succeed in expanding trade and boosting exports of American products and services to the rest of the world. That is why we have worked so hard to create the global opportunities that will lead to more and better jobs at home. We won the fight for the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Uruguay Round of

the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Our commitment to free and fair trade goes beyond NAFTA and the GATT. Last December's Summit of the Americas set the stage for open markets throughout the Western Hemisphere. The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) group is working to expand investment and sales opportunities in the Far East. We firmly believe that economic expansion and a rising standard of living will result in both regions, and the United States is well positioned both economically and geographically to participate in those benefits.

This Administration has also worked to promote American products and services to overseas customers. When foreign government contracts have been at stake, we have made sure that our exporters had an equal chance. Billions of dollars in new export sales have been the result, from Latin America to Asia. And these sales have created and safeguarded tens of thousands of American jobs.

HEALTH CARE AND WELFARE REFORM: THE UNFINISHED AGENDA

In this era of rapid change, Americans must be able to embrace new economic opportunities without sacrificing their personal economic security. My Administration remains committed to providing health insurance coverage for every American and containing health care costs for families, businesses, and governments. The Congress can and should take the first steps toward achieving these goals. I have asked the Congress to work with me to reform the health insurance market, to make coverage affordable for and available to children, to help workers who lose their jobs keep their health insurance, to level the playing field for the self-employed by giving them the same tax treatment as other businesses, and to help families provide long-term care for a sick parent or a disabled child. We simply must make health care coverage more secure and more affordable for America's working families and their children.

This should also be the year that we work together to end welfare as we know it. We have already helped to boost the earning power of 15 million low-income families who work by expanding the earned income tax credit. With a more robust economy, many more American families should also be able to escape dependence on welfare. Indeed, we want to make sure that people can move from welfare to work by giving them the tools they need to return to the economic mainstream. Reform must include steps to prevent the conditions that lead to welfare dependency, such as teen pregnancy and poor education, while also helping low-income parents find jobs with wages high enough to lift their families out of poverty. At the same time, we must ensure that welfare reform does not increase the Federal deficit, and that the States retain the flexibility they need to experiment with innovative programs

that aim to increase self-sufficiency. But we must also ensure that our reform does not punish people for being poor and does not punish children for the mistakes of their parents.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

Taking power away from Federal bureaucracies and giving it back to communities and individuals is something everyone should be able to support. We need to get government closer to the people it is meant to serve. But as we continue to reinvent the Federal Government by cutting regulations and departments, and moving programs to the States and communities where citizens in the private sector can do a better job, let us not overlook the benefits that have come from national action in the national interest; safer foods for our families, safer toys for our children, safer nursing homes for our elderly parents, safer cars and highways, and safer workplaces, cleaner air and cleaner water. We can provide more flexibility to the States while continuing to protect the national interest and to give relief where it is needed.

The New Covenant approach to governing unites us behind a common vision of what is best for our country. It seeks to shift resources and decision-making from bureaucrats to citizens, injecting choice and competition and individual responsibility into national policy. In the second round of reinventing government, we propose to cut \$130 billion in spending by streamlining departments, extending our freeze on domestic spending, cutting 60 public housing programs down to 3, and getting rid of over 100 programs we do not need. Our job here is to expand opportunity, but bureaucracy—to empower people to make the most of their own lives. Government should be leaner, not meaner.

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

As 1995 begins, our economy is in many ways as strong as it has ever been. Growth in 1994 was robust, powered by strong investment spending, and the unemployment rate fell by more than a full percentage point. Exports soared, consumer confidence rebounded, and Federal discretionary spending as a percentage of gross domestic product hit a 30-year low. Consumer spending should remain healthy and investment spending will remain strong through 1995. The Administration forecasts that the economy will continue to grow in 1995 and that we will remain on track to create 8 million jobs over 4 years.

We know, nevertheless, that there is a lot more to be done. More than half the adult work force in America is working harder today for lower wages than they were making 10 years ago. Millions of Americans worry about their health insurance and whether their retirement is still secure. While maintaining our momentum toward deficit reduction, increased exports, essential public investments, and a government that works better and costs less, we are committed to providing tax

relief for the middle-class Americans who need it the most, for the investments they most need to make.

We live in an increasingly global economy in which people, products, ideas, and money travel across national borders at lightning speed. During the last 2 years, we have worked hard to help our workers take advantage of this new economy. We have worked to put our own economic house in order, to expand opportunities for education and training, and to expand the frontiers of free and fair trade. Our goal is to create an economy in which all Americans have a chance to develop their talents, have access to better jobs and higher incomes, and have the capacity to build the kind of life for themselves and their children that is the heart of the American dream.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1995.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution No. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPUBLICAN CRIME BILL GOOD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Contract With America crime bill was introduced as H.R. No. 3, the Taking Back Our Streets Act. The bill strikes at the heart of the violent crime problem by fixing countless problems with the Clinton crime bill and fixing larger problems with the criminal justice system.

The Clinton crime bill addressed the crime problem through more questionable social spending and sleight-of-hand changes in the criminal justice system. The Taking Back Our Streets Act, however, sends a tough warning to would-be criminals, do the crime, serve

the time. To facilitate the consideration of the crime bills on the House floor, H.R. 3 was divided into six bills: The Victim Restitution Act, which was passed; the Exclusionary Rule Reform Act, which was passed; the Violent Criminal Incarceration Act, which was passed; the Criminal Alien Deportation Act, which was passed; and the Effective Death Penalty Act.

Now before the Congress is the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grant. Today we continue to solidify the Republican approach to battling crime by considering that H.R. 728 measure, which is designed to place control of Federal anticrime dollars where it belongs, in the hands of the local law enforcement officials who are at the front line in the battle against crime, to decide for themselves where the funds should go for local programs.

H.R. 728 replaces major portions of the President's crime package which passed last year. While the Clinton bill set up categorical grants with no local flexibility, this new legislation solves that problem by establishing block grants to help units of local government improve public safety.

Use of funds under H.R. 728 can include the hiring of police officers, training and equipping law enforcement officers and support personnel. It can also be used to enhance local school security or establish crime prevention programs which directly involve law enforcement personnel such as community policing, town watch, drug courts, special programs to stop crimes against senior citizens, or prevention programs to stop abductions and exploitation of our children. This new bill does not affect in any way the police funding already established in the 1994 crime bill.

The bill authorizes \$10 billion for law enforcement block grants over 5 years with \$2 billion to be distributed each year from 1996 through the year 2000. Most importantly, this bill allows localities greater flexibility responding to their own crime problems. Our own Chief William Kelly of Montgomery County, PA, has had programs instituted with community policing, which are really the outstanding ones of Pennsylvania and the country, I believe. District Attorney Mike Marino's outstanding community program with DUI offenders that pick up the litter all across the county have been the model for Pennsylvania. While crime statistics show that crime has been on the upswing, we know that we can with this bill make a real difference.

The overwhelming incidence of crime occurs within State-level jurisdictions, so these authorities bear the primary responsibility for combating this mounting crisis. However, the Federal Government cannot abrogate its responsibility. Through the Contract With America, Republicans recognize that the best thing we can do is to allow the local authorities, through block grants, the opportunity and flexibility to fight crime in the manner

best for each community by providing them with those block grants.

The Clinton approach to battling crime was very different. After nearly a year of congressional hearings, mark-ups, and floor votes, a delayed recess and weekend votes, the best the previous Congress could do was come up with expensive, Great-Society-type programs. In this new bill before the House it repeals many of the social experiments and replaces them with solid funding which can be used by the local authorities in the manner they think best to fit their needs. This represents a commonsense approach to battling crime on this Nation's streets.

Finally, Congress is listening to the experts in law enforcement and have given them the tools they need to fight crime at home.

Back in my home district of Montgomery County, PA, I have an anticrime advisory board which advises me on the best ways to battle crime locally. They have counseled me on how the Federal Government can assist them in their efforts without bankrupting this country. When they spoke, I listened, because they are the ones who are putting their lives on the line every day. They are the ones that see the damage that crime can cause.

I applaud this new effort on crime as we set forth in our Contract With America. We may face criticism from those who are naysayers, who would rather keep this massive bureaucracy in Washington, which has actually hindered some of our anticrime efforts. But as long as I represent the people of Montgomery County, I will take my directions from them, not from the bureaucrats in Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEBATE TIME ON NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this 5-minutes special order this evening to partly respond to some of the rhetoric that we heard on the House floor earlier, primarily coming from the minority side, on the allocation of 10 hours of debate on the National Security Revitalization Act which we will have on the House floor Wednesday and Thursday of this week. While I am not going to get into all the details and implications of that piece of legislation, I do want to respond to several of the issues that were raised here tonight by the leadership of the minority side.

□ 2240

Mr. Speaker, we heard it said that when President Bush was in office we had extensive debate before our troops were asked to go into Desert Storm, and that, in fact, is correct, because it was asked for by President Bush and this Congress responded.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on the other side, where was that same debate when all of us jointly asked for a debate on sending our troops into Haiti. We had known we were going to go into Haiti for months at a time. Many of us had asked for a full and open debate of that issue where our troops were being put in harm's way. We were not given 10 minutes of debates on this House floor prior to sending our troops into Haiti.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, where was the debate on this House floor that now sees American tax dollars being used to pay the salaries, the benefits, the housing costs, and the travel for about 2,000 troops from Third World nations that are currently providing protection inside of Haiti? Where was the debate so the American people could vote on that issue before that action took place? Where was the debate on Bosnia, so we could fully debate the President's policy? We never had any debate on Bosnia prior to Presidential action.

Mr. Speaker, I say with a great deal of concern, where was the debate in this House on the President's decision to go in and bail out Mexico? He wanted to do it to the tune of \$40 billion but could get no support. Then unilaterally he sent a \$20 billion loan guaranty. Where was 10 minutes of debate on this House floor before the action?

Mr. Speaker, where was the debate in this House, on this House floor, prior to President Clinton or even after President Clinton changing our policy in terms of national ballistic missile defense? Prior to President Clinton taking office, we had an aggressive program that was also attempting to protect the American people as well as our troops. When the President took office, he unilaterally, without any debate on this House floor, changed that policy.

Mr. Speaker, we are giving ample opportunity for debate. We want bipartisan support. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology of the Committee on National Security, I reached out to my colleagues on the other side. We forged a bipartisan national security bill. This bill, when it was reported out of committee, passed by a vote of 41 to 13. Eleven of our colleagues on the minority side supported that piece of legislation.

In the committee, Mr. Speaker, many of us acknowledged that there were key Democrats who were at the forefront of the defense debate, both in the past, today, and in the future. So that bill, when it came out of committee, had strong bipartisan support, and, in fact, 11 Democrats voted with us.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, to get their support, before the markup of the National Security Revitalization Act we reached out and made 32 specific changes in the bill. This was not some piece of legislation jammed down the throats of committee members. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we reached out, and over the weekend before the markup, made changes that Democrats offered to us to enhance the bill and to get their support for that particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in total, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman, allowed 32 separate changes to be made in the chairman's mark. Mr. Speaker, this was in fact a bipartisan bill, a bill that reflects our concern with the direction this administration has been going in terms of national security. We are going to have our debate on the floor, but to somehow attempt to mislead the American people, and there were so many distortions and half-truths that were spoken by our colleagues on the House floor, is a gross injustice, both to this institution and to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we will have a chance to get all those issues out on the table on Wednesday and Thursday of this week. I look forward to that debate, and I hope that the American people will also be watching the debate and the final vote on restoring our national security interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to speak to the issue of what the minority talked about as far as the majority not supporting national defense. I can remember being on this floor, Mr. Speaker, when the majority, or the now-minority, turned their backs on our men and women in Desert Storm, would not support them, and yet we had debate on that issue.

I can remember the first event that they brought up was homosexuals in the military, when the majority of military folks do not want homosexuals in the military.

I remember that most of that same leadership, all of the leadership, voting for Clinton's tax bill, which cut defense \$177 billion, and then also put the highest tax that they had ever had on the American people. They had increased the marginal tax rate of the middle-income taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I can look, and when Colin Powell and Dick Cheney and then-candidate Clinton said that anything below \$50 billion would put us into a hollow force, but yet these same Members that are now saying that they are hawks cut defense \$177 billion. Not a single Democrat at the Democratic White House fundraiser put a foot down when military men and women in uniform were serving as waiters. It would have happened at our fundraiser, I guarantee you.

I can remember at the extension of Somalia, we then in the minority voted against it, saying it would cost billions of dollars. Then I also look at how the policy was changed toward General Aided. General Aided is still there, by the way. Then we weakened our strength. Then they denied armor, and then we lost 22 Rangers and 77 wounded. Why? Because the Democratic leadership would not support our troops.

Now they say that we are weakening national security. Twenty-two killed and seventy-seven wounded, with the father of one of those killed that received the Medal of Honor chastising the President.

Mr. Hunter. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who is one of our experts on missile defense.

The gentleman is talking about H.R. 7, the Defense Revitalization Act, part of the Contract with America that is coming up in a day or 2 on the House floor. He is one of the few Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, who has had the experience of being shot down by an enemy missile in his illustrious career in serving in Hanoi.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I don't know if it is illustrious, being shot down.

Mr. HUNTER. But he managed to get five MiG's before they got him.

I guess I would ask my friend, he has seen the language that places us square in the middle of the missile age. That is, it mandates that we develop theater defense against missiles, and we develop a national defense against missiles.

I would asked the gentleman, what is your feeling with respect to our timing? Do you think we are coming too early, too late? What is your opinion with respect to missile defense?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would say to my friend, the gentleman from California, my first concern is yes, I believe looking at Desert Storm and the other, that we need to support missile defense. However, I want to tell the gentleman from California, which may not be the position that he wants, I look at the Air Force. They want the C-17, they want the B-12, they want the F-22, and they want F-15's, and the Navy wants to upgrade F-14's and the Air Force F-115's.

We need to take a balanced look and see how much money is available without taking from the other services. I support missile defense, but I think we have to be real careful with the funds available, and we are cutting down everything.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

With respect to national missile defense, what is the gentleman's feeling with respect to what the former Soviet States are doing, and with respect to what China and North Korea are doing?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the liberal side of the Democratic leadership would tell us that there is no threat from Russia, but yet the Soviet dropped five nuclear-class *Typhoon* submarines last year, that is five nuclear submarines, when we gave them \$1 billion to dismantle nuclear weapons.

They built a MiG 35, which is superior to the SU-27, which is superior to our F-14's and F-15's. They have an AA-10 missile which is superior to our Amram missile, so they are investing in those kinds of weapon systems, while ours are going down.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at what they are doing in pushing out the joint airplane, they are pushing out beyond the year 2010, when we have no chance of building up even to a Bottom-Up Review level.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

AMERICAN MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and then to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], to ask first the gentleman from Pennsylvania about his feeling with respect to H.R. 7, the Contract With America, regarding missile defense of the Nation and missile defense of our theater forces.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, in response to the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] the Russians also, as we know, have been selling their submarines. They recently sold at least two submarines to Iran.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Two *Kilo* class.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And Iran has been doing very well in the training of those submarines, which presents a whole new threat for us, with Iranians having capability in the seas.

The question of our colleague and friend on missile defense is an important one. This President changed our policy from the Reagan and Bush era with absolutely no warning to this Congress, to say that we no longer need to have a defensive system to protect

the American people, in spite of the ABM treaty, which allows the Russians to have the only operational ABM system in the entire world right now, which surrounds Moscow and which is in fact operational.

□ 2250

What we are saying in the contract is we want the Secretary of Defense unlike what we heard from one of our colleagues on the other side today say that we want immediately a space-based system. That is not what the contract provision says. It says that we want the Secretary to come back and tell us what kind of national ballistic missile system we can deploy now.

In conversation with General O'Neill who heads ballistic missile defense last week and a follow-up meeting I am having this week, he says that at the basic we can install a program within 2 years that would cost no more than \$5 billion over 5 years. So the figures we are going to hear on Wednesday and Thursday are going to be way out of line and are going to be more rhetoric than they are substance.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for reminding us that the Secretary of Defense did say he could build a system for the type of attack that he expects in the context of expecting some type of an offense against the United States, what he calls a thin attack. He said he could do it for \$5 billion in a couple in years, and I think that the gentleman who propounded that question, our friend Mrs. SCHROEDER from Colorado was a little bit shocked at his low number, because I think she came back and said, "Wait a minute. What's it going to cost total?" And he said, "\$5 billion total."

In the context of the 5-year defense plan, that is roughly .004 of the total defense numbers, .004 of the budget. So that is not a number that is going to crowd out readiness or modernizing our military. The only thing that is going to crowd those things out is the President's budget itself. And the President himself has cut \$9 billion just between FY 1995 and FY 1996 in modernization. So the President is doing the cutting. One slap of the pen by the President cutting \$9 billion in modernization had doubled the impact on the modernization budget of building what Secretary Perry himself described as doable, that is, a missile defense nationally that will defend against the thin attack.

So if we are asked would you rather have a defense that will defend against a thin attack or nothing, but absolutely naked, I think the American people say, give us something, give us some missile defense against that accidental launch or that third-world terrorist attack.

I would be happy to yield to the fine gentleman from San Diego, my seat mate, Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think another important factor, and gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

WELDON] brought it up. When we brought this bill up in the committee, we had 41 Republicans and Democrats vote for it. Only 13 voted against it. I want to tell you, those 13, their politics would go good only in a small island off Florida.

I would also like to remind the Members, Mr. Speaker, that the contract talks about not having U.S. troops under U.N. control. Very, very important. We lost 22 Rangers and 77 wounded in Somalia. Because, for example, it took 7 hours for our troops to get to all those Rangers that lost their lives and were wounded because the U.N. control had never used night goggles, it was at night, many of them did not speak English, some of them could not even drive the equipment. We want to eliminate that, and that is another reason for bipartisan support.

The part that I am upset, the liberals that have done everything in their power to cut national security, to cut defense of this country now stand up and object at the majority when it is a bipartisan bill that is coming out of the committee itself, what same minority. We are glad that that leadership exists. Let them talk.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 33 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the Speaker for affording us this opportunity to address a subject which is extremely important and critical.

We have seen this week the opening of the markup in the subcommittee on the House Committee on Ways and Means of the welfare reform bill. We have had a lot of discussion about the issues surrounding welfare reform. Last week we saw the Republican version of their Contract With America with regard to family responsibility, and we saw also the response on the Democratic side with respect to what they would like to see in terms of a reform measure.

We are here tonight because we believe that voices of the women and children who will be primarily affected by what this Congress does in reforming welfare have not been heard and probably will not be heard from during the course of this debate. It is imperative that as we consider this legislation, we think of it in terms of the women and the children.

I am very happy tonight, at this very late hour, to be joined by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], who has been a great leader on this subject and whose voice continues to be heard for the women and children of this country. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii for

yielding me the time and thank her for arranging this special order.

I would just like to enter into a discussion with you and raise a couple of concerns that I have and perhaps have you to explain your knowledge of the Personal Responsibility Act.

If the block grant goes, and it appears that we are going to have that structure for a number of programs that are going to be put in a basket called welfare reform that will allow different ways of providing services. I am particularly concerned about the nutritional part.

Let me first say, I support welfare reform. I think our welfare system does not work well. It does not encourage self-sufficiency and we need to make sure the system works well for the recipients as well as for the government itself. So we need welfare reform. But we do not need welfare reform just for change sake itself. We need it for a better system, for a system that is improved, a system that is obviously going to serve people better.

In the areas of nutrition, we are not necessarily perfect but those are areas where we help people. We have food stamps, the school lunch program, we have the WIC program, the commodity program, the senior citizens program, all of those programs which speak to the needs certainly of people who are in need but also speak to needs of people who may be working.

For the food stamp program, 20 percent of the food stamp program is received by persons who are working families. My concern is if we block-grant that program, not only do we drastically reduce the amount of moneys that will be available but also we put the States themselves into the business of setting national nutritional standards. These programs have worked well to make sure children are fed and are prevented from disease.

If now we block-grant it, does that not mean that each State would have the responsibility of setting nutritional and dietary standards for the implementation of those programs.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. Not only will the States be given the responsibility of setting up the criteria and the eligibility standards, but indeed they could move the moneys around within that category and, as I read the legislation, even take out 20 percent from one block grant to put into another program.

Mrs. CLAYTON. So it is possible that all that money would not go to feed the hungry, feed children or seniors, they could do other things with it.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Exactly. They could do other things with it. It seems to me that in the area of nutrition in particular, Congress has been very, very careful in looking at the needs of specific groups of individuals in our society, children in the schools for school lunch, senior citizens in their centers, in congregate dining programs and

meals on wheels and for the tiny infants, the women-infant-children's program has been established for that specific targeted group of people.

□ 2300

And the commodities program has been a kind of a consolidated farmers' surplus interest program together with matching up the needs of the poor in our society, and food stamps, we all know, has been a Godsend to millions of families whose nutrition for their families has been supplemented because of their ability to exchange their earnings or money in exchange for a greater value of food coupons.

So of all of the block granting that has been recommended under the Contract With America, it seems to me the one that is least justified is the suggestion of putting all of these groups together and allowing the States to pick and choose which programs they want to support and which ones they do not. I think it would be a real tragic mistake, and I hope that the committee ultimately will not do that.

Mrs. CLAYTON. One of the things we want to emphasize is that those nutritional programs are not only there to speak to the need, because people are poor, but also to speak to their dietary deficiency and, as a result of that, they have found that they have opportunities to address diseases, they have opportunities to address deficiencies of growth and development, and if you remove that, some of the nutritional achievements we have made, WIC, for pregnant women and mothers who are nursing, those achievements, I think, will be lost. We will regress; rather, we will have a system, one system in North Carolina, another in Mississippi, another in Hawaii. Now we have some uniform standards where we are moving all Americans to a standard that perhaps can improve their health.

For one thing, I think that is a tremendous benefit that we can move in that area.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Our reluctance in not supporting the block grant is not because we do not have confidence in local officials in their being able to perceive what the needs are of their constituents. Their constituents are our constituents.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Absolutely.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. So I have full confidence in my State and local elected officials to know what is appropriate for our community. But I also believe that the Congress of the United States has an important responsibility in establishing the priorities, understanding what the needs are of Americans all across the country, and coming up with programs that match surplus commodities and requirements of our farming communities. That is how the Food Stamp Program got started.

I was here when it happened. Congresswoman Lenore Sullivan was the one who put it all together, from the great State of Missouri, and it has worked, and it has been a boon to the farmers of this country, and it has met

a tremendous need in all of our poorer communities.

So it is tragic that in formulating this concept of welfare reform that they have sought to pool this money and disregard the initial intent of Congress in formulating these targeted special programs. Our concerns are concerns, I am sure, that are shared by most of the Members on the minority side, and I hope that when this debate reaches the floor, we will have opportunities to debate this issue fully, to offer amendments to correct this major oversight.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I am receiving a tremendous amount of mail both in the areas of school lunch and in the areas of senior citizen programs.

We know the value of having it with young children and pregnant women in terms of those areas, so I would hope, as we debate that, we will have people on both sides of the aisle seeing the value of this deliberation and trying to salvage this program and protect the nutritional value of this program as well as the integrity of these programs, because the nutrition programs by and large have worked, and we ought to celebrate those things that have worked, correct those things that have not, and reform where we are improving the system.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Hawaii for her fine work and leadership.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentlewoman for participating this evening in the special order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], who is the ranking member of one of my subcommittees, the Educational Economic Opportunities Committee of the House.

Mr. KILDEE. I support the gentlewoman on her position on nutrition. School lunch, school breakfast are extremely important programs. They will all be apparently put into this nutrition block, although we have not been given the information as to how this will be done. They say it will be somewhat separate, but we know we have so many needs in that School Lunch Program. We have different students, those that get the free lunch, the reduced lunch, the paying students, and we have just finished and completed a deep study of the nutritional values of those lunches.

I am afraid this will be lost in this block grant also, because they have not shared with us yet what they intend to do with the School Lunch Program.

THE PERSIAN GULF WAR: WE VOTED OUR CONSCIENCES

But I came over here tonight primarily to speak on another subject very briefly, and I really appreciate the fact that the gentlewoman has yielded to me.

While I was sitting in my office listening to the monitor, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], my good friend, and he is a very good friend of mine, I have great respect for

him, from San Diego, stated that the Democrats, the majority party, had turned their back on our troops in the Persian Gulf. That really hurt me, particularly coming from a friend like the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and I voted differently on that war. We both voted our consciences. The position I took was shared by Gen. Colin Powell, a great American. I voted my conscience, as the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] voted his conscience, and by voting my conscience, I was not turning my back on our troops.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the war began in Iraq, the first person who stood at that podium right there the following morning, the first person was DALE KILDEE from Michigan saying that while we had disagreed on policy, now that the war had started we should give our troops our full and complete support. We were not turning our backs on our troops.

I took particular offense, because that statement came from a friend of mine, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I took another offense, too, Mr. Speaker. I have two sons who are lieutenants in the U.S. Army. My one son is beginning Ranger training. When he finishes that, he will go to Korea.

My votes on the policy of how we deploy our troops do not make me less concerned about the safety of our troops, and I would hope that in the next 2 days as we debate the defense of this country that we not question the patriotism of one another or the support of our troops.

The 440 Members of this House, 435 voting Members and 5 nonvoting Members, are loyal Americans who want nothing to happen to our troops. I want all the sons and daughters of America who serve in the Armed Forces to be treated as I would want my own two sons to be treated, with full support.

But because we may disagree, as we disagreed on the Persian Gulf war, does not make one less loyal or less American or less supportive of our troops.

Now, I know the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] did not realize the full ramifications of his statement, but that debate we had was one of the best debates, no, not one of the best debates, the very best debate that I have heard in my over 18 years in the Congress of the United States, and that is why this is a deliberative body.

Because someone may vote one way and another another way should not call into question the patriotism or loyalty or support of the our troops.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman for his very strong refutation of our colleague from California, because I was here on the floor and heard those statements likewise.

Resuming my special order, which is to bring to focus some of our concerns

about the welfare debate, I do so tonight even though the hour is late, because tomorrow is a very special day. There is to be a special program on the Hill, Welfare reform with a heart, children speaking for themselves.

□ 2310

This will occur on Capitol Hill. It will be first initiated by a press conference at 9 o'clock in the morning in the Rayburn Building, followed from 10 o'clock until 2:30 with children and youth from the District of Columbia coming in and participating during those several hours, and what they will be doing is reading letters and speaking out, presenting testimony about their own experiences as children in a welfare family.

One of the real tragedies in a very esteemed institution like the Congress of the United States in the hearings that we call in our various committees, and this is not unique to the current majority because it was also a situation when the Democrats were in the majority, that we have these hearings called, and experts from various fields are called: economists, professors, physicians, doctors, psychiatrists, lawyers, whatever, are called to testify, and we very seldom ever have the opportunity to hear from the very persons who are affected by the programs that we are debating, and in this case we are talking about welfare families and the children, about 5 million adults and 9 million children, and I am here tonight to speak specifically for the women and children.

There are 49 women Members of the House of Representatives, but very few of us are on the committees that will be making these decisions, and therefore it is important to focus our attention on some of these matters.

Today there was a press conference which was called by the Council of Presidents, which is a bipartisan coalition of the leaders of approximately 100 national groups, and they have formulated a position on welfare which I would like to take the time tonight to read and explain. Heidi Hartman, who leads the Institute for Women's Policy Research, was the guiding force in putting together the coalition on this subject. We heard from the NOW Legal Defense Fund. We heard from Eliza Sanchez, who was the president of Manna, an organization that has been working pay equity. There was a representative from Planned Parenthood, from the National Women's Law Center, and from Wider Opportunities for Women. These were some of the groups of the 100.

And this is important because women have come together to put together what they believe ought to be the central points of any discussion having to do with welfare reform, not the myths, not the stereotypes, not the punitive aspects of trying to moralize and change human behavior, but what is truly the responsibility of the Federal Government with respect to poor fami-

lies. Poverty in America is a condition which affects all peoples across the country, and we need to focus this issue on the question of poverty.

Let me read for my colleagues what the Coalition of Presidents said today at the press conference. It said, and I quote:

NATIONAL WOMEN'S PLEDGE ON WELFARE REFORM, PRINCIPLES FOR ELIMINATING POVERTY

We support welfare reform that will do more than maintain families in poverty. It should help them make a permanent escape from poverty. The vast majority of adults who receive assistance from AFDC are women. As leaders of women's groups in the United States, we state unequivocally that women who receive welfare benefits have the same rights as all women and have the same goals for their families. We cannot allow their rights to be curtailed because they are poor, nor their values impugned because they need help to support their families. Welfare has served as an essential safety net for poor women and their children. Many women use welfare at various points throughout their lives because they have few other resources to tide them over during one-time or recurring events such as illness, unemployment, childbirth, domestic violence, or divorce. We cannot allow the guarantee of minimum survival assistance to be removed or reduced by caps on spending, time limits, child exclusion policy, or other means. We cannot allow the Federal Government to abandon its commitment to a basic safety net for poor mothers and their children. We oppose punitive measures that assume the behavior attitudes and value of women on welfare are the problem. Welfare mothers have not abandoned their children. They are struggling to hold their families together with extremely limited resources. Many are already working or looking for work in order to raise their families' incomes. We believe the problem lies rather in the labor market where the women face enormous barriers, including gender and age-based discrimination that limits their opportunities, unstable jobs that pay low wages and the lack of health and retirement benefits, inaccessible jobs, and no jobs at all. In addition, lack of educational opportunity, inadequate support services and benefits, lack of child support from fathers and punitive welfare regulations have made it impossible for poor women to get ahead.

That is the end of their opening paragraph outlining their principles for eliminating poverty and the basis upon which the debate on welfare reform, in their view and mine, should be considered.

I think it is very important to recognize that, when this debate started over a year ago, and the Republican Party offered their proposal, and the President offered his, we were not in this debate to try to find ways to cut the funding, to address the issue at another level in terms of deficit reduction or trying to reduce the debt. As a matter of fact, the Republican proposal at that time for welfare reform included some \$12 billion of additional funding which in their program was required in order to meet the requirements of education, training, counseling and, most importantly, child care provisions in order for women to go to get an education or training, and, in

the final analysis, to hold a job child care is essential.

The President's proposal also had very strong ingredients of funding, I believe at the level of around \$7 billion to provide for education, training, counseling and the important element of child care.

The strangest thing happened over the last year. Now we are looking at proposals which eliminate the concept of Federal responsibility for providing educational opportunities and training, counseling, helping to find a job, and when they do, to have the necessary child care provisions in the programs. The Republican proposal leaves it out. The Democratic proposal has not yet formulated exactly how they are going to fund the additional needs. They have said, well, the States say they can do it all, and, therefore, let us see what the Governors can come up with. It seems to me that, unless we deal with the subject of welfare reform with the seriousness and earnestness of trying to help these families and not punish them and push them off as if they do not exist, then there is no possibility that we are going to be able to reduce funding as is currently being proposed by the Republican bill in the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 2320

What is required is an honest, deliberate decision, that women on welfare first of all want to work. There is all kinds of evidence and empirical statistical studies that show that women on welfare want to work. The problem with the system right now is that when they are in need and apply for welfare, there is no one there to meet them at the door and to help them try to solve their family situation, find them a job, take them into training or education. They are simply accepted into the system, given assistance, and more or less left to their devices.

Furthermore, the system also punishing women on welfare, because if they have the initiative to go out to work, to find a job, then they are immediately cut off from cash assistance, frequently they have to lose food stamps, and perhaps even get off of Medicaid health care.

So the burdens on welfare families are tremendous and the government, the State, and Federal Government has not offered them the support.

Now for the first time it seems to me at least a year ago that both sides of the aisle looked at this honestly and said we are going to change the welfare system, we are going to change the way that the Government deals with welfare families by initiating an offer to help for education and training and job counseling, and we are going to provide child care. And this has to be done with an understanding it is going to cost additional sums of money in order to implement.

So what do we find today in the Republican proposal? We have a notion

that they will also do away with entitlements. There will no longer be a requirement that the Federal Government will guarantee some level of cash assistance to a child whose parent is without work and in poverty.

Under the current system, for the past 60 years Congress and this country have said no poor child should be left hungry, without food and shelter and clothing and medical care. A country as great as America cannot afford to let a child die in starvation and in ill health and in disease. This is a fundamental responsibility of the Government.

So 60 years ago we established this program of aid to dependent children, and we guaranteed that every child in America that met the eligibility criteria of poverty and being in a family where there was no person able to work, that the Government would find same way to assist that family with a cash assistance and other supportive programs.

We do not have a national program under which a set figure of money is given to every family pro rata for every child in America. It is instead a collaborative program with the States, with the States participating in a 50-50 matching situation.

So we have States like mine that come up with a cash assistance program well above most of the other States in the country, somewhere around \$600 per family of three. At the lower end of the 50 States is Mississippi, where the contribution by the Federal and the State is \$120 for a family of three. So there is this huge range of difference in terms of what the welfare program means in the different States.

The States have provided this range of difference. So we are not saying at this juncture that the Federal Government ought to require a certain set figure. I wish we could. But certainly we should not at this juncture be removing the entitlement assurance guarantee that every child in this country has from the U.S. Government. But that is precisely what the Committee on Ways and Means subcommittee is now considering, and I think that that is a very, very grave mistake.

If they adopt this block grant approach, taking the average of spending for the program back to 1991 to 1993 and averaging it out and saying this is the amount of money that the States are going to receive based upon the prior experience, then it makes no adjustments for increases in numbers of families or changes of the economy, recessions, greater unemployment, closures of companies and major corporations in a certain area that would increase the numbers eligible for assistance.

So I think that one of the fundamental issues that this House will have to face is the question of whether we retain the idea of an entitlement or whether we go the way of a block grant, which will create enormous burdens upon the States, and eventually I

think come back to the Congress for supplemental support and supplemental assistance.

It seems to me we ought to decide right now that one of the basic virtues of the current program is the fact that there is this entitled notion and it ought to be retained.

There are other proposals that are in the wind with respect to the Committee on Ways and Means proposals. They have to do with cutting off families after 2 years if they are not able to find work. There is no support program to help individuals find a job, no support program for education and training that is specified in the legislation, and I think that it would be very, very harmful for many thousands of families who will find themselves without assistance unless we provide that kind of help.

There is this notion that is very, very difficult to refute, and I hear it from my constituents, as I am sure most of my colleagues do from theirs, and there is this impression that people on welfare stay there for enormous lengths of time and that this is a problem that must be rooted out, and one way of doing that is to make a work requirement that is short, as in this 2-year proposal by the Republicans, and on the Democratic side, where they are required to come in with some sort of a work strategy.

But I think that what is so difficult to deal with is this impression that people have that people on welfare are in for enormous lengths of time.

The truth of the matter is, and when you look at the data and statistics, persons that come on welfare are out of there, at least half of them, are out of welfare after only 11 months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The time initially allocated to the gentlewoman from Hawaii has expired. However, because the majority leader has not designated a person to be recognized for the balance of the time remaining, the gentlewoman from Hawaii may proceed for up to 27 more minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. The statistics are there. The census data has been evaluated. All the records of the department have been researched, and we find the outstanding conclusion that the majority of parents who come into welfare are there less than a year. Eleven months is the average. This means they are there for temporary assistance, the vast majority of them. And if the Government had been more ready to assist them, provide them with some assistance in locating a better job that paid higher wages or helped them with medical care, which in many cases is the reason for families coming on welfare, the place that worked that provided perhaps just a bare minimum wage salary did not include health care provisions, so the moment when a child became sick, they had to quit work and come back on the welfare system. But the moment

that the illness passed and the family was together again, that parent would be out there looking for work.

The idea that is out there which is so pervasive that people on welfare are unwilling to work simply is not true. So I therefore support the idea of a work oriented system, because I believe that that truthfully meets the needs of people on welfare. They need assistance, they need education, they need training, they need job counseling. Somebody has to go out there to help them obtain a job which can support their families beyond what they were getting on welfare in terms of cash assistance.

□ 2330

We see that the vast majority of families, actually 80 percent of the families on welfare, are out of the welfare system in a 2-year period, more than 50 percent in 11 months and 80 percent in the 2-year period.

Therefore, we are dealing with a highly transitional group of individuals. There are some that find it very difficult to find a job, or because of their lack of education and training and having no job skills, have extreme difficulties in locating work. However, the vast majority of individuals on welfare, roughly about 80 percent, from the figures that I have seen, are in the system only for a short period of time, 2 years and less, and have, on the average, 4 years of work experience.

Because that is the reality, it seems to me that the Federal Government, with a strong, integrated, personally adaptive work training, work counseling kind of strategy, can help these families get off of welfare even faster and into a job that pays more than the welfare support check was paying them.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to the other issue, and that has to do with the minimum wage question. It is vital, Mr. Speaker, that we deal with the minimum wage issue part and parcel to the welfare discussion. I know that the Republican leadership has discarded the whole idea of getting into minimum wage. However, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be realistic in terms of doing something to change the whole system of welfare, we have to be willing to look at exactly what the minimum wage situation does. It just oppresses single-family situations far greater than families that have two working parents. But in the single family situation, working for a minimum wage dooms that family to perpetual poverty. That is the tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the statistics, we find that over 60 percent of the people who are working today for minimum wage or less are women. There are about 4 million persons in America that work at \$4.25 or less, and of that number, 2,603,000 are women; 1,000,078 of these women are wives or single-parent heads of families. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage by 90 cents over a 2-year period will help

tremendously the women and children of these families, well over 1 million families where both parents work, or the single family situation.

Mr. Speaker, of the total number of women who work for minimum wage or less, 80 percent are white women. Twelve percent are black women, and 8 percent are Hispanics. Contrary, again, to the myths of most of our thinking, Mr. Speaker, the families that would be most benefitted by an increase in the minimum wage are the white, Caucasian families in this country. Eighty percent of the total number of women are white, as I said.

Mr. Speaker, if we raise the minimum wage from \$4.25 an hour, where families now only earn \$8,000-plus a year, the increase of 90 cents an hour would raise the annual earning to \$10,300-plus dollars, an increase of \$1,714. That is a tremendous increase. Forty-five cents each year for 2 years, raising the minimum wage from \$4.25 to \$5.15, will lift millions of families out of poverty, and will be one of the important steps that we could take to help ensure that families on welfare will not come back onto welfare because their earnings are insufficient to sustain their family.

Mr. Speaker, one of the ironies is that in the early deliberations of the whole welfare discussion, we adopted the notion that if a welfare family went out and got a job, they would immediately lose all their benefits. It was a disincentive to work.

We want to make sure now that when we are talking about welfare reform, that such disincentives are removed. We want to make sure that there are enough incentives there to make it attractive for women in particular to go out and hold a job, and to support their family on this self-sufficiency model which has been discussed.

I am all for that, Mr. Speaker. I want to see opportunities made possible to these families all across America. That is what this debate ought to be about, enlarging opportunities, not in punishing and establishing all of these negative restrictions in terms of who can receive a benefit and who cannot.

Mr. Speaker, the AFDC has also another very, very difficult myth out there. A lot of attention has been placed on the factor of women coming onto welfare and having another child while on welfare.

One of the punitive suggestions is to deny that child born to that parent while she was on welfare from any cash support whatsoever. I cannot think of anything more cruel and inhuman than a suggestion to punish a child.

The statistics reveal again, from the Census Bureau, from the Department of Health and Human Services, from all the people who collect data, that the number of children born to these families on welfare is no different than the average family in America.

As a matter of fact, most families on welfare have two children, and that is it. Very, very small numbers of persons

on welfare have more than two children. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, an even smaller percentage of individuals on welfare have a child while on welfare.

The suggestion that welfare mothers will be encouraged to have another child because they can increase their cash benefits is ridiculous, because the average additional cash assistance ranges around \$45 to \$85 across the States. I cannot imagine any person deliberately deciding they should have another baby for that amount of money. In point of fact, that does not occur.

Mr. Speaker, the other aspect which is in the Republican plan is to make it impossible for teenagers who have children to receive any welfare assistance unless they live at home with their parents or with another qualified adult, or if they subsequently get married to the father of that child.

Such a prohibition of cash benefits aimed at the child, because it was born out of wedlock, is simply a concept and principle that I cannot understand or accept.

□ 2340

Furthermore, in looking at studies, many of the lawyers and others who have studied this issue maintain that it is unconstitutional because it creates a category within a benefit situation which clearly has no justification whatsoever.

And so I am hopeful that even if the Congress should put such a provision in, that the case will be taken to courts and the Supreme Court decisions which have been rendered on this subject, starting from 1973, case in New Jersey, the New Jersey Welfare Rights Organization versus Cahill held that the denial of such rights was a violation of the 14th amendment, the equal protection clause.

The court in 1972 in Webber vs. Aetna Casualty said,

The status of illegitimacy has expressed through ages society's condemnation of irresponsible liaisons beyond the bonds of marriage, but visiting this condemnation on the head of an infant is illogical and unjust. Moreover, imposing disabilities on the illegitimate child is contrary to the basic concept of our system that legal burdens should bear some relationship to individual responsibility or wrongdoing. Obviously no child is responsible for his or her birth.

There is a series of other cases that relate to this point.

So I feel quite confident that the legal scholars who have brought this matter to the attention of the Congress know what they are talking about, and so if this provision which denies a child from birth to age 18 from receiving any benefits whatsoever under the welfare system, then surely someone will take it to court and will prevail and such a harmful provision will be stricken from this bill.

Let me in closing call the Members' attention to a very important report that came across my desk. It is produced by the Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutritional Policy at Tufts

University. I believe all Members received this booklet. It is appropriately in lovely pink color for Valentine's Day. It was published by J. Larry Brown and it is a review of evidence on welfare reform.

He points out in his book that they collected a very large number of people to collaborate on this study and made some very, very important conclusions which I would like to briefly outline.

The 1995 Tufts University center report which is entitled "Key Welfare Reform Issues, The Empirical Evidence."

The report presents scientific data that, one, welfare benefits do not cause the growth in single parent families and single parent families are not the major factor of the growth of poverty in America. It urges that Congress avoid the tragic mistake of adopting pseudo-reforms that stem from political ideology rather than empirical evidence. It advises that if we wish to break the cycle of poverty, we not be guided by the wish to punish poor women whose behavior we wish to chastise.

In 1994, 76 researchers and scholars in the field of welfare issued a policy statement regarding the empirical facts that they found in their research which challenged the political leaders in terms of the assumptions that they were making in presenting their legislation.

Fact No. 1. Growth in the number of single parent families has been primarily among the non-poor.

From 1970 to 1990, the number of female-headed households increased from 6 million to 11 million, mostly among the non-poor. Sixty-five percent of the increase in single parent families were not living in poverty. For instance, in 1993, there were 3.5 million unmarried non-poor couple households and one-third of them had at least one child. This family would fall under a single parent definition. Changes in welfare laws will not affect the mores and lifestyles of these families. In fact the Contract of America will give these families a \$500 tax credit for each child regardless of their marital status.

Fact No. 2. The Census Bureau found that economic factors such as low wage jobs accounted for approximately 85 percent of the child poverty rate. A 1993 Census Bureau study showed that the poverty rate was due mainly to changes in the labor market and the structure of the economy. Bureau of Labor statistics data from 1973 to 1990 revealed that the proportion of persons employed in service industries grew from 70 to 77 percent. And this is the lowest wage sector of our economy.

Between 1960 and 1980, the proportion of women in the labor market increased from 40 to 61 percent ages 16 to 34.

The desire to have women work is limited to only poor women with dependent children to teach them responsibility. For non-poor women, the need to remain in the home to nurture their children to wholesome maturity is still

the social ethic of our times. Forcing women to work is destructive of family values.

That is the essence of the report of the Tufts University which I commend to my colleagues to read. It has been delivered to your offices sometime in late January.

There are many issues that need to be discussed. One that I have championed almost my entire political career is the need for child care. When I was in Congress in the 1960's and 1970's, we did put together a comprehensive child care bill which passed both the House and the Senate, but it was vetoed by President Nixon. Since that time, there has not been a major effort to insist that there was a government responsibility for child care. But now that we are again debating this issue of welfare, it seems to me that we cannot succeed in this area of welfare reform requiring work as a criteria for continued participation in the system unless we systematically and with full intent and knowledge subscribe to the understanding that women cannot be asked to go to work if they have small children unless we have child care provided to that family. It is unrealistic, it simply is unworkable.

And so the idea of work for welfare is a great concept. The idea of education and training in order that people could work to get off welfare is a marvelous idea. But none of these things can work unless that family has support in terms of someone to take care of their children while they are at work.

Women's work at home is a valuable contribution to our society. Women's responsibility in the home has always been accorded a place on the pedestal of our society at large. It continues to be debated as to whether some women ought to work or ought not to work. But the issue has always been a matter of choice. Women choose to work. Women ought to have equal opportunities to work. And when they do work, they ought to be accorded the same privileges of advancement, promotions and so forth and their pay ought to be the same, and there should be no gender discrimination. That is the ethic which has evolved up to the present time.

But when we are dealing with the welfare community, we are adopting a new frenzy of requirement to work. I can support a requirement to work, but it must always be in addition and connected with a concept of child care.

That brings me to the final concluding thought that I want to leave. Welfare reform is about children. It is not about punishing adults. It is about how this Nation is going to care for its children. It is going to provide the support, health care, housing, food, nutrition, clothing and a loving family environment. That is what poor children should expect as the policy and principle that guides this government.

□ 2350

And so as we look at this legislation, I prevail upon this House to put aside all of these myths, all of these things that have brought us to this point of discussing welfare reform, and never forget that the people on welfare that were thought of, that created the AFDC program in the first place 60 years ago, were the children.

America was concerned about the fate of these children in poverty, and they established the entitlement program where every child could at least have some assurance of care and food and nutrition and a family environment, and I hope that as we move on this debate that the children will be the primary concern that we have.

If we are successful in keeping our eye on focus on the children, I believe that the legislation that we will put through will be of benefit to these families and will lift them out of poverty and will make their situations far better than what they are enduring today under their current conditions.

I urge this House to remember tomorrow is Valentine's Day and that the welfare children will be here, will want to have someone to talk to. Please, stop by the give them your loving attention and concern.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATT of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on February 15.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COBURN, for 5 minutes, on February 15.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today and on February 14.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATT of North Carolina) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, in 2 instances.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. OWENS, in 2 instances.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. EVANS.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. CARDIN.

(The following Members (on request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. BARR.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. FOWLER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

362. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of February 1, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104-32); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

363. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending December 31, 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); to the Committee on Commerce.

364. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

365. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution's "Annual Proceedings of the One Hundred Third Continental Congress," pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 18b; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

366. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the December 1994 issue of the Treasury Bulletin, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 83, Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States (Rept. 104-31). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KLUG, Mr. WILSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HAYES, Ms. FURSE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the application of the passive loss limitations to timber activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 903. A bill to substitute evaluations of educational quality for cohort default rates in eligibility determinations for proprietary institutions of higher education under the Federal student assistance programs; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 904. A bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from contracting with foreign contractors for ship repair until a certification is made to Congress; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 905. A bill to provide for congressional approval of a nuclear aircraft carrier waste disposal plan before the construction of CVN-76, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 906. A bill to reform the child support enforcement system in order to maximize collections of child support payments on behalf of poor children in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWDER (for himself and Mr. BENTSEN):

H.R. 907. A bill to amend certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the treatment of Members of Congress and congressional employees for retirement purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 908. A bill to authorize appropriations for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000 for the provision of grants for construction of wastewater treatment works to serve U.S. colonies and for connecting residents to sewer collection systems and making any necessary plumbing improvements to enable residences to meet existing county or city code requirements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DORNAN (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KING, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 909. A bill to encourage liberty inside the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Ms. KAP-
TUR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. OLVER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 910. A bill to require the Secretary of State to establish a set of voluntary guidelines to promote socially responsible business practices for United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONO, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANADY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COX, Mr. DAVIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. Miller of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PETRI, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 911. A bill to encourage the States to enact legislation to grant immunity from personal civil liability, under certain circumstances, to volunteers working on behalf of nonprofit organizations and governmental entities; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways

and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 912. A bill to permit registered utility holding companies to participate in the provision of telecommunications services; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 913. A bill to repeal the provisions of law commonly referred to as the Ramspeck Act; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 914. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Solid Waste Disposal Act to limit the liabilities under these acts of both fiduciaries and lending institutions, including finance lessors, guarantors, and others directly or indirectly holding indicia of ownership primarily to protect a security interest in property which is subject to either act; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 915. A bill to expand the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and sale of firearms and ammunition, and to expand the jurisdiction of the Bureau to include firearm products and non-powder firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 916. A bill to prohibit the manufacture, importation, exportation, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns, and handgun ammunition, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H.R. 917. A bill to establish procedures for product liability actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 918. A bill to reduce the official mail allowance of Members of the House; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 919. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require that the Secretary of Commerce produce and publish, at least every 2 years, current data relating to the incidence of poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. VOLKMER (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. QUILLLEN):

H.R. 920. A bill to repeal the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and to combat crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself and Mr. BISHOP):

H.R. 921. A bill to encourage gainful employment among the residents of public

housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. COYNE, Mr. YATES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HORN, Mr. FROST, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. FORD):

H.R. 924. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of colorectal screening under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HORN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. NEY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. KIL-DEE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. PRYCE, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ):

H.R. 923. A bill to provide for the establishment of an official mass mailing allowance for Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. McKEON (for himself, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. BONO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FARR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KIM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WAX- MAN, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIVING- STON, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ):

H.R. 924. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring any National Forest System lands in the Angeles National Forest in California out of Federal ownership for use as a solid waste landfill; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a postage stamp should be issued to honor the 100th anniversary of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 42: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. RAN- GEL, Ms. MCCARTHY, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 70: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 77: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 127: Mr. LEACH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. THORNTON.

H.R. 217: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 218: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 244: Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GIL- MAN.

H.R. 325: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 359: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 363: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. FOGLI- ETTA.

H.R. 370: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 450: Mr. COBLE, Mr. BRYANT of Ten- nessee, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 451: Mr. COOLEY and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 485: Mr. McKEON.

H.R. 548: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 549: Mr. BONO, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 555: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 558: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 562: Mr. STUMP, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 579: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 586: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 612: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 682: Ms. DANNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. CREMEANS, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 709: Mr. MORAN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 759: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 785: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOX, Mr. YATES, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 795: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 800: Mr. HERGER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 809: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FROST, Ms. DANNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 819: Mr. FOX.

H.R. 844: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 867: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 873: Mr. KIM, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. METCALF, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HAN- COCK, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jer- sey, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 898: Mr. SAXTON.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. FORBES.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 30: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. WATT of North Caro- lina, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. FOG- LIETTA, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and reso- lutions as follows:

H.R. 555: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. TALENT.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, pro- posed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 7

OFFERED BY: Mr. DURBIN

(Page & line references are to H.R. 872)

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 63, line 4, strike "In particular," and insert "Numerous Central and East European countries, particularly".

Page 63, line 5, insert a comma after "Slo- vakia".

Page 66, after line 12, insert the following new paragraphs (and redesignate the suc- ceeding paragraphs accordingly):

(7) that, when any other European country emerging from communist domination is in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area, it should, in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty, be invited to become a full NATO member, provided it—

(A) meets appropriate standards, including each of the standards specified in clauses (i) through (viii) of paragraph (5)(A); and

(B) remains committed to protecting the rights of all its citizens and respecting the territorial integrity of its neighbors;

(8) that the United States, other NATO member nations, and NATO itself should fur- nish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of other European countries emerging from communist domination to full NATO membership at the appropriate time;

Page 67, line 3, insert "and" after "vot- ing";.

Page 67, line 8, strike the semicolon and in- sert a period.

Page 67, strike out lines 9 through 21.

H.R. 7

OFFERED BY: Mr. EDWARDS

(Page & line references are to H.R. 872)

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 11, line 18, after "missile attacks" insert the following: "and that is deployed without the inclusion of any space-based interceptors".

Page 12, line 6, after "missile attacks" in- sert the following: "without the inclusion of any space-based interceptors".

H.R. 7

OFFERED BY: Mr. HEFLEY

(Page & line references are to H.R. 872)

AMENDMENT No. 5: Strike out section 309 (page 21, lines 19 through 22) and insert the following:

SEC. 309. FUNDING.

Funds for the activities of the Commission shall be made available to the Commission by the Secretary of Defense from funds ap- propriated for activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

H.R. 7

OFFERED BY: Mr. SKELTON

(Page & line references are to H.R. 872)

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of title II (page 12, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 204. READINESS CERTIFICATION.

Of the total amount of funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Depart- ment of Defense for fiscal year 1996, the amount obligated for national missile de- fense programs may not exceed the amount made available for national missile programs for fiscal year 1995 until the Secretary of De- fense certifies to the Congress that the Armed Forces are properly sized, equipped, and structured and are ready to carry out as- signed missions as required by the national military strategy:

H.R. 7

OFFERED BY: Mr. SKELTON

(Page and line references are to H.R. 872)

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 73, line 15, strike the close quotation marks.

Page 73, after line 15, insert the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The number, types, and costs of NATO armed forces that would be required to de- fend the country and the number, types, and costs of United States Armed Forces that would be required as part of such a NATO force.

"(6) Whether the United States is prepared to provide a nuclear guarantee to the coun- try.

"(7) The likelihood that the country may become involved in disputes or armed conflict with neighboring countries in the region."

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. BEREUTER

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 10, after line 24, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

"(4) the unit of local government—

"(A) will provide for each payment period non-Federal matching funds equal to not less than 20 percent of the amount paid to the unit under this title for the period:

"(B) will deposit the matching funds for a payment period in the trust fund established by the unit under paragraph (3) on the same day on which the unit deposits the amount paid under this title for the period; and

"(C) will spend the matching funds only for the purposes set forth in section 101(a)(2).

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. BEREUTER

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Page 12, after line 7, insert the following:

"(10) the unit of local government will spend not more than 50 percent of the funds received under this title to purchase law enforcement equipment and hardware, including but not restricted to vehicles, machinery, communications equipment, and computer equipment, that assist law enforcement officials in reducing or preventing crime and improving public safety unless the Attorney General certifies that extraordinary and exigent circumstances exist that make the use of more than 50 percent of such funds for such purposes essential to the maintenance of public safety and good order in such unit of local government.

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. FIELDS OF LOUISIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 23: Page 4, strike lines 3 through 10 and insert the following:

"(C) Establishing crime prevention programs for juveniles that substantially involve both educators and law enforcement officials.

Page 8, after line 19, insert the following:

"(h) SET-ASIDE FOR CERTAIN CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS FOR JUVENILES.—A unit of local government that receives funds under this title for a payment period shall allocate not less than 20 percent of such funds for the purpose of establishing programs under subsection (a)(2)(C).

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. HOKE

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 12, line 4, strike "and".

Page 12, line 7, strike "101(a)(2)." and insert "101(a)(2); and".

Page 12, after line 7, insert the following:

"10 the unit of local government—

"(A) has an adequate process to assess the impact of any enhancement of a school security measure that is undertaken under section 101(a)(2)(B), or any crime prevention program that is established under section 101(a)(2)(C), on the incidence of crime in the geographic area where the enhancement is undertaken or the program is established;

"(B) will conduct such an assessment with respect to each such enhancement or program; and

"(C) will submit an annual written assessment report to the Director,"

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. KASICH

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Strike section 101(f) and everything that follows through section 102(a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) REPAYMENT OF UNEXPENDED AMOUNTS.—"(1) REPAYMENT REQUIRED.—A unit of local government shall repay to the Director, by not later than 25 months after receipt of funds from the Director, any amount that is—

"(A) paid to the unit from amounts appropriated under the authority of this section; and

"(B) not expended by the unit within 2 years after receipt of such funds from the Director.

"(2) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REPAY.—If the amount required to be repaid is not repaid, the Director shall reduce payment in future payment periods accordingly.

"(3) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS REPAID.—Amounts received by the Director as repayments under this subsection shall be deposited in a designated fund for future payments to units of local government.

"(g) NONSUPPLANTING REQUIREMENT.—Funds made available under this title to units of local government shall not be used to supplant State or local funds, but shall be used to increase the amount of funds that would, in the absence of funds made available under this title, be made available from State or local sources.

"SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

"(1) 1,944,200,000 for fiscal year 1996;

"(2) 1,944,200,000 for fiscal year 1997;

"(3) 1,944,200,000 for fiscal year 1998;

"(4) 1,944,200,000 for fiscal year 1999;

"(5) 1,944,200,000 for fiscal year 2000.

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. KASICH

AMENDMENT NO. 26: Page 8, line 23, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and insert "1,944,200,000".

Page 8, line 24, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and insert "1,944,200,000".

Page 8, line 25, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and insert "1,944,200,000".

Page 9, line 1, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and insert "1,944,200,000".

Page 9, line 2, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and insert "1,944,200,000".

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 4, after line 19, insert the following:

"(G) Sports league programs that shall require each player in the league to attend employment counseling, job training, and other educational classes provided under the program, which shall be held in conjunction with league sports games at or near the site of the games.

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. SCOTT

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Beginning on page 8, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 9, line 2, and insert the following:

"(1) \$2,500,000,000" for fiscal 1996;

"(2) \$2,500,000,000" for fiscal 1997;

"(3) \$2,500,000,000" for fiscal 1998;

"(4) \$2,500,000,000" for fiscal 1999; and

"(5) \$2,500,000,000" for fiscal 2000.

H.R. 728

OFFERED BY: MR. SCOTT

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 8, after line 19, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subsections accordingly):

"(h) EVALUATION.—From the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year, the Director shall reserve one-tenth of one percent for use by the National Institute of Justice to evaluate the effectiveness of programs established under this title and the benefits of such programs in relation to the cost of such programs.